DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 116 210 CS 202 411

AUTHOR Dieterich, Daniel J.
TITLE The Training of College Students in Illinois as Critical Receivers of Public Persuasion.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 167p.; Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$8.24 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS College Students; Communication (Thought Transfer); *Course Content; Doctoral Theses; *English Instruction; Higher Education; Instructional Materials; *Mass Media; *Persuasive Discourse; *State Surveys
IDENTIFIERS Illinois; *Speech Communication

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine how well today's students are being trained to deal with the persuasive messages which they receive through the mass media. The study involved two questionnaire surveys: the first a survey of 235 chairpersons of departments of speech and English in institutions of higher education in the state of Illinois--132 responded--and the second a survey of 315 teachers of persuasion in departments of speech and English in Illinois institutions of higher education--102 responded. Although 83 percent of the responding teachers said they attempt to prepare students as both senders and receivers of persuasion, 43 percent of these emphasize the role of sender and only 15 percent emphasize the role of receiver. Teachers mentioned using 68 different texts in their teaching of persuasion, but only one of these was used by as many as 10 respondents. Supplementary materials from the mass media were used frequently by only 25 percent of the English teachers and 33 percent of the speech teachers responding. Conclusions and recommendations for improving the training of students at all educational levels in the reception of public persuasion are provided, as are suggestions regarding the training of teachers of persuasion. (Author/RB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED116210

THE TRAINING OF COLLEGE STUDENTS IN ILLINOIS AS CRITICAL RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC PERSUASION

BY

DANIEL JOHN DIETERICH

B.A., DePaul University, 1968
M.A., DePaul University, 1969

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Daniel John Dieterich

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in English
in the Graduate College of the
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1976

Urbana, Illinois

CS 202 411

THE TRAINING OF COLLEGE STUDENTS IN ILLINOIS AS CRITICAL RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC PERSUASION

Daniel John Dieterich, Ph.D.
Department of English
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1976

The quantity and the efficacy of modern persuasion transmitted via the mass media are unprecedented. Television, radio, newspapers, magazines, and direct mail appeals are being used with ever improving efficiency to relay the persuasive messages constructed by today's professional persuaders: teams of market analysts, psychologists, sociologists, communication experts, and behavioral scientists. Whether these persuasive messages are designed to sell a candidate, a product, a program, or a philosophy, they frequently do so with well refined skills. It was the purpose of this study to determine how well today's students are being trained to deal with the persuasive messages which they receive through the mass media.

The study involved two questionnaire surveys: the first a survey of chairpersons of departments of speech and English in institutions of higher education in the State of Illinois and the second a survey of teachers of persuasion in departments of speech and English in Illinois institutions of higher education. It was thought that Illinois might be representative of many states which have large urban, suburban, and rural populations and diverse educational philosophies; that responses from institutions of higher education might indicate something of the direction which the study of persuasion is taking in the lower schools as well; and that departments of speech and English, though not the only departments in which persuasion is taught, were the departments in which persuasion might be studies by the largest number of students.

The first questionnaire was sent to those listed as chairpersons of English and speech departments in the most recent directories of the Modern Language Association and the Speech Communication Association and to those listed as directors of freshman composition programs in the most recent directory of the Conference on College Composition and Communication. This questionnaire was mailed to 235 chairpersons and directors in October 1974. Of this number, 132 responded. The survey revealed that about one-third of the departments responding have at least one course devoted to the study of persuasion, with speech departments outnumbering English departments two to one in this regard. Units on persuasion are offered by 82% of the departments responding, while neither a course nor a unit is offered by 13% of those responding. Though only one-third of those responding said that their courses on persuasion are required, 85% of the courses which are required are required of speech majors only. Five-eighths of the courses containing units on persuasion appear to be introductory courses in speech and English. Of these units, 46% last two weeks or less and 43% last between two weeks and one month. Units offered by speech departments last longer than do units offered by English departments, with only 19% of the units offered by speech departments and 4% of the units offered by English departments lasting longer than one month.

The second questionnaire was sent to 315 teachers specified in the first survey as teaching courses or units on persuasion. Of this number, 102 responded. The training of students as critical receivers of persuasion was the main goal of only 4% of the teachers responding, while 13% said that they sought to prepare students as persuaders, and 83% said that they attempted to prepare students for both roles. Of this last group, 43%

said that they emphasized the role of persuader; 15% emphasized the role of persuadee; and 42% emphasized both roles equally. Twice as many teachers of English cited argumentation, logic, and logical fallacies as receiving major attention in their courses and units as cited propaganda techniques, advertising persuasion, and political persuasion. Though teachers of speech gave more evenly distributed emphasis to the twelve aspects of persuasion on which they were asked to comment, the largest percentage gave major emphasis to advertising persuasion, argumentation, logic, and propaganda techniques. Teachers surveyed mentioned using 68 different texts in the teaching of persuasion, only one of which was used by as many as ten respondents. These texts were highly diverse in content and approach, but speech texts were more likely to concentrate on persuasion, while English texts were more likely to devote a chapter or less to this subject. Supplementary materials from the mass media were used frequently by only slightly more than one quarter of the English teachers responding and by only slightly more than one third of the speech teachers responding.

An analysis was made of these findings as they apply to speech and English departments, two-year and four-year institutions, private and public institutions, and large and small institutions. Conclusions and recommendations for improving the training of students at all educational levels in the reception of public persuasion are provided, as are suggestions regarding the training of teachers of persuasion.

Acknowledgment

I am deeply grateful to Prof. Alan C. Purves, my major advisor, for the encouragement and guidance which he gave to me on this dissertation, and also to Prof. Harris Wilson and Prof. Jerry L. Walker, the other members of my dissertation committee, for their scholarly counsel. I am also grateful to the many other members of the departments of English, speech, and education at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign who generously gave their time to advise me. And I owe a special debt of gratitude to the hundreds of speech and English teachers in Illinois who completed and returned my questionnaires. My debt is greatest to Diane Dieterich, whose patient support enabled me to complete the following study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. THE TRAINING OF STUDENTS AS CRITICAL RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC PERSUASION 1

II. A SURVEY OF DEPARTMENTS OF ENGLISH AND SPEECH IN ILLINOIS REGARDING THE STUDY OF PERSUASION 15

III. A SURVEY OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH AND SPEECH IN ILLINOIS PRESENTLY TEACHING PERSUASION 33

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 64

V. REFERENCE MATTER

Bibliography 90

Appendix A: Questionnaires and Explanatory Letters. 96

Appendix B: Results of the Departmental Survey in Table Form 109

Appendix C: Results of the Teacher Survey in Table Form 124

Vita 158

CHAPTER ONE

THE TRAINING OF STUDENTS AS CRITICAL RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC PERSUASION

Persuasion is not a new feature of our language environment. Perhaps it is as old as language itself. But there is some indication that the quantity and the efficacy of present day persuasion are unprecedented. In the words of Hugh Rank, former chairperson of the Committee on Public Doublespeak of the National Council of Teachers of English, "Since 1945, there has been a quantum change in persuasion. Yes, people have always tried to persuade others. Aristotle, 2500 years ago, outlined the basic patterns. But, since 1945, the money expended (by Madison Avenue, by the Pentagon, by the Democrats and Republicans, by the USSR); the technology used (computers, television, etc.); and the sophisticated coordinated use of corporate manpower have made a tremendous difference."[1]

We live at a time when the "favorite way to spend an evening" for 46% of the American populace is watching television; for only 14% of the populace is it reading.[2] We also live at a time when billions of dollars are expended on public persuasion. In 1974, $26,780,000,000 was spent on advertising in America. In 1975, it is expected that the advertising volume will increase by six percent to $28,390,000,000. And 1976 should see an additional increase of 10% in advertising expenditures.[3] These expenditures are possible because there are now over 9,500 periodicals and over 11,000 newspapers published in the United States. Almost every American home has a radio and over 96% of all households have one, two, or more television sets.[4] All of these varied media, and many others besides (billboards, bumper stickers, direct mail appeals) are geared for persuasion. And, due to the "sophisticated coordinated use of corporate manpower," it is persuasion

constructed by professional persuaders, teams of market analysts, psychologists, sociologists, communication experts, and behavioral scientists. Their aim may be to sell a candidate, a product, a program, or a philosophy to their audience. Whatever the case, they have at their disposal tools and techniques which enable them to be extremely effective.

Those in the advertising industry contend that advertising lowers prices by increasing sales, that it builds markets and thus acts as a mainstay of our economy, and that it serves to inform the American public so that the public can make intelligent purchasing decisions. Those not in the advertising industry sometimes see the effects of advertising in another light. Some contend that it discourages change by reinforcing existing values and attitudes, thus enforcing conformity; that it makes people buy things they don't need and can't afford; that it encourages materialism; that it supports our continuing destruction of the environment; that it lowers ethical standards by providing people with numerous examples of the theory and practice of deception; and that it stresses petty, inconsequential values.

Both supporters and opponents of advertising readily acknowledge the pervasive nature of advertising. Commercial advertising is one form of public persuasion which students in elementary school, secondary school, and college encounter every day. According to an address by Gerald S. Looney at the 1971 convention of the American Academy of Pediatrics in Chicago, the average high school graduate has watched television for 22,000 hours, during which time this average

young person has viewed 350,000 commercials. In view of the massiveness of this persuasive effort, it would seem wise to instruct students so that they can make critical decisions about the advertising which they see and hear.

It would also seem wise to instruct students to deal with the other forms of public persuasion which they encounter through the mass media. They should, for example, be trained to critically evaluate the statements of public officials and candidates for office. As citizens in a democracy, they will have to make decisions about whom to elect to important local, state, and national offices. They will also have to evaluate a wide variety of plans and programs which will be undertaken by their government. In making their decisions, students will be forced to rely heavily on the persuasive messages of candidates, public officials, newspaper editors, and television and radio news reporters and commentators. However, this reliance must be accompanied by an understanding of the tools of persuasion if citizens are to make critical, reasoned judgments about these important matters. Recent developments on the American political scene, developments encompassed by the term "Watergate," have led some to question whether Americans have the critical skills they need to make political decisions based not upon impulse or emotionalism but a reasoned evaluation of the comparative qualifications of two candidates.

Hugh Rank contends that "Today's generation is experiencing a propaganda blitz unequaled in human history. In our daily, unnoticed environment we Americans are subjected to more ads and more political

persuasion than ever generated in the supposedly 'classic' propaganda campaigns of Nazi Germany."[5] Rank also contends that teachers of language have an obligation to prepare their students as receivers of persuasion.

Some teachers of language have been fulfilling this obligation for some time now. In elementary language arts classes, in secondary classes in English and speech, in college courses in general semantics, mass media, communications, etc., some teachers have long worked to prepare students as critical listeners, critical readers, and critical viewers of persuasive messages. But as the expertise of public persuaders increases, so does the need to prepare students as receivers of persuasion.

Despite this concern by individual teachers, the question of whether public persuasion is presently receiving adequate attention in American classrooms has not yet been answered. Yet, the question is an extremely important one. It has been said that it takes an average of fifty years for an educational innovation to be widely implemented in the classroom. Though the study of public persuasion does not exactly fit the definition of "educational innovation"--having been taught to at least some degree in America ever since the founding of Harvard to train young men for the Puritan ministry--the study of public persuasion as it is carried out through the modern mass media may well be described as an innovation. Some fear that it is an innovation being added to the curriculum too slowly.

In order to make informed judgments about how to incorporate the study of public persuasion into the curriculum, we must first learn what is currently being done to prepare students in this area. In the following pages, I will review recent research which deals, at least tangentially, with this matter.

Thomas W. Wilcox's A Comprehensive Survey of Undergraduate Programs in English in the United States was a four-year study, involving both interviews and a questionnaire survey, which examined many areas of the English curriculum in great detail. However, none of Wilcox's findings deal specifically with the study of persuasion, probably because few of the programs which he studied devoted substantial attention to the subject outside of the context of literature study or composition. The most significant aspect of the Wilcox study, as it relates to persuasion, is that it reveals few substantive changes in the teaching of English. Wilcox himself alludes to the "fact (which findings of this study may be used to confirm) that few if any major renovations in the structure (of undergraduate English) have been effected in the past two or three decades."[6] The only important additions to the curriculum which Wilcox refers to are courses in black literature and film. This would seem to indicate that Wilcox found no significant number of courses on the reception of public persuasion being added to the English curriculum.

If college English departments are not devoting a significant number of upper level courses specifically to the study of persuasion, perhaps persuasion is being dealt with in the introductory English or

composition course. If this is the case, two recent surveys are of particular interest. Ron Smith's 1973 study of 491 four-year colleges and universities revealed "fewer students taking fewer required writing courses at fewer schools."[7] More specifically, "at only 45% of all schools surveyed are there at present composition requirements of two or more courses. . . . That's a drop, since 1967, of 32.8%." Further, "only 76% of all schools have a composition requirement of one course or more, a drop of 17.2%."[8] Thus, if public persuasion is being taught in freshman composition courses, fewer students are now required to take such courses.

Page Tigar's 1974 "ADE Survey of Freshman English" gives some slight indication of the extent to which public persuasion is now being covered in freshman English courses. The Tigar survey reveals "above all, a general confusion on the question of the goals and methods of the freshman course."[9] It also reveals that "the most widespread trend in response to this confusion is a return to the study of formal rhetoric, usually in its simplest form--the organization of paragraphs and short themes according to patterns of exposition."[10] Although some teachers are using the media, they are using it "as a teaching aid to gain the students' interest and as a subject for themes. . ."[11] Less than 10% of the writing assignments were "papers based on language, perception, media, propaganda, etc.";[12] less than 20% of the respondents used magazines and newspapers in conjunction with their basic text;[13] and less than one-third of the respondents considered the main purpose of their course to be "to make the student aware of the power in

language and communication."[14] The question of how students in freshman English are being prepared in the critical analysis of public persuasion in those courses where it exists was left unanswered by the Tigar survey.

Since the preparation of students as public persuaders has long been an acknowledged aim of speech departments, substantially more information is available on the teaching of persuasion in college speech departments. A study of 564 institutions of higher education conducted in 1969 revealed that teaching units on "persuasive speaking" were found in 80% of the introductory speech courses in junior colleges; in 92% of those in colleges, and in 86% of those in universities; units on "ethics" were found in 52% of the junior college courses, 28% of the college courses, and 34% of the university courses; and units on "emotional appeal" were found in 40% of the junior college courses, 45% of the college courses, and 42% of the university courses.[15] Of those surveyed, 18% reported that they had as a course objective to "develop listening ability"; 15% had to "develop critical abilities and standards"; 9% had to "understand ethical role of speaking"; and 4% had to "understand use of emotional and motivational appeals."[16]

A study by June Prentice dealt specifically with the teaching of persuasion in U.S. senior colleges and universities. The study, conducted in 1971 and entitled "The Status of Recent Experiemental, Empirical, and Rhetorical Studies in the Teaching of Persuasion," involved a questionnaire survey of 180 speech teachers. This survey

revealed that persuasion is taught in the majority of the departments responding; that most courses include both theory and performance; and that most teachers also use experimental studies in teaching persuasion.[17] Unfortunately, this study failed to explore the question of the degree to which persuasion courses prepared students as critical receivers of persuasive messages.

The preparation of elementary and secondary school students in the U.S. as receivers of public persuasion is explored in James Crook's 1972 study, "Teaching about Mass Media in Society in the Public Schools." This study showed that "the level of teaching about mass media in society through courses and units was about 20 percent of the schools or less in 1972."[18] It also revealed that "Units about mass media were more common than courses," and that "The teaching about mass media was greatest in both units and courses at the senior high school level, followed by the junior high school level and the elementary school level."[19] Crook concludes that "The study suggests the nature of the content of mass media courses be that of an investigation of the crucial role of mass media in a democratic society and the leveling effect of the mass media on the taste and popular culture of the people. It suggests the instruction should include a combination of the work traditionally thought of as part of the social studies and language arts curricula. It is the recommendation of this study that the instruction begin when a youth enters school and deal with the media which affect him during his learning years."[20]

Surprisingly enough, it would appear that elementary and secondary teachers in Australia are more concerned about the effect of the mass media on their students than are teachers in America. A questionnaire survey of Australian elementary and secondary teachers which was conducted in 1973 revealed that "most English teachers agree that 'study of the media' is within the compass (of English study), and they are in general agreement (between 96% and 99%) that helping students evaluate mass media techniques is part of their role."[21]

As I was unable to locate any information which dealt specifically with the training American students are now receiving on how to become critical receivers of the persuasive messages transmitted via the mass media, and as it would seem to be important to have such information in order to make informed decisions about the direction future curriculum development should take at the elementary, secondary, and college levels, I undertook the present study.

This study was designed to determine the extent to which persuasion is being taught in speech and English departments in Illinois institutions of higher education, the importance which these departments place on the study of persuasion, the aspects of persuasion most emphasized by teachers, the approaches being taken to the subject, and the texts and other materials employed in the study of persuasion.

The study was done in the state of Illinois because Illinois was representative of many other states in its large urban, suburban, and rural populations, its wide variety of educational institutions, and its diverse educational philosophies. The study was limited to institutions of higher education, and it was felt that these institutions

might also indicate something of the direction which the study of public persuasion is taking in elementary and secondary schools as well, since these frequently follow the lead of the institutions of higher education in their state. Finally, the present study was devoted exclusively to the study of persuasion carried out by departments of speech and English. This was done with the full knowledge that aspects of public persuasion are also taught in such departments as advertising, anthropology, philosophy, political science, and psychology. However, departments of English and speech were selected because it is in these departments that the reception of public persuasion might be studied by the largest number of students.

Two questionnaires were constructed by the author with the help of a dissertation committee composed of members of the English and education departments at the University of Illinois in Urbana/Champaign. The first questionnaire survey, sent to those listed as chairpersons of English and speech departments in the most recent directories of the Modern Language Association and the Speech Communication Association and to those listed as directors of freshman composition programs in the most recent directory of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, contained fourteen questions designed to elicit information about the importance which the departments surveyed placed on the study of public persuasion. Included in the survey were two-year and four-year, public and private, large and small institutions. English, speech, communication, and related departments listed in the

directories were surveyed. This occasionally led to duplicate responses. (The director of freshman English and the chairperson of the department of English would both reply and describe the same program.) When such duplicate responses were noticed, only one of the two was tabulated. However, it was decided that it would be better to use all three directories and risk such duplications than to use only two directories and thus possibly fail to survey some departments at all.

In October 1974, the first questionnaire was mailed to 235 chairpersons and directors. Enclosed with this questionnaire was a cover letter by Dr. Alan C. Purves, dissertation advisor for this study, explaining the importance of this survey; a second cover letter by the author providing directions on how to complete the questionnaire; and a stamped, self-addressed envelope (see Appendix A). In February 1975, a second mailing of questionnaires was sent to those who had not yet responded. In all, some 160 responses were received in this first survey, of which 132 were usable. The 28 other responses were not usable either because the department or college to which the questionnaires were addressed had ceased to function or because the response was a duplicate of one already received.

In March 1975, a second questionnaire survey was conducted, this one surveying those listed in responses to the first survey as teaching courses or units on persuasion. Some 315 teachers were contacted in this survey, of whom 102, or approximately 32%, responded.

Notes

[1]Hugh Rank, ed., Language and Public Policy (Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1974), p. xiv.

[2]According to a Gallup survey conducted in early 1974 and reported in Edward W. Barrett's, "Sex, Death and Other Trends in Magazines," Columbia Journalism Review, July/August 1974, p. 26.

[3]"Ad Volume in '75 Expected to be 6% above Last Year," Advertising Age, 15 Sept. 1975, p. 3.

[4]U.S. Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstracts of the United States (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1974) p. 504.

[5]Rank, p. xiii.

[6]Thomas W. Wilcox, A Comprehensive Study of Undergraduate Programs in English in the United States (Storrs: University of Connecticut, ED 044 442, 1970), p. 185.

[7]Ron Smith, "The Composition Requirement Today: A Report on a Nationwide Survey of Four-Year Colleges and Universities," College Composition and Communication, 25 (1974), p. 146.

[8]Ron Smith, "Implications of the Results of a Nationwide Survey for the Teaching of Freshman English" (Paper presented at the Conference on College Composition and Communication, ED 094 400, 1974), p. 1.

[9]Page Tigar, "ADE Survey of Freshman English," ADE Bulletin, No. 43 (November 1974), p. 13.

[10]Ibid., p. 13.

[11]Ibid., p. 14.

[12]Ibid., p. 16.

[13]Ibid., p. 17.

[14]Ibid., p. 19.

[15]James W. Gibson, Charles R. Gruner, William D. Brocks, and Charles R. Petrie, Jr., "The First Course in Speech: A Survey of U.S. Colleges and Universities," Speech Teacher, 19 (1970), p. 15.

[16]Ibid., p. 16.

[17]June Eleanor Prentice, "The Status of Recent Experimental, Empirical, and Rhetorical Studies in the Teaching of Persuasion," Dissertation Abstracts International, 32 (1972), 6691A (North Texas State University).

[18]James Arthur Crook, "Teaching about Mass Media in Society in the Public Schools," Dissertation Abstracts International, 34 (1973), 2325A (Iowa State University).

[19]Ibid.

[20]Ibid.

[21]Australian Council for Educational Research, Current Issues in the Teaching of English: Report on a Questionnaire Study: English Curricula in Australia (Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service, ED 083 614, 1973), p. 18.

CHAPTER TWO

A SURVEY OF DEPARTMENTS OF ENGLISH AND SPEECH IN ILLINOIS REGARDING THE STUDY OF PERSUASION

In order to assess the extent to which persuasion was taught in departments of speech and English in Illinois institutions of higher education and to determine what importance these departments placed on the study of persuasion, a questionnaire was distributed to department chairpersons. Responses to the questionnaire were tabulated for the group as a whole (132 respondents) and also separately for the following subdivisions: two-year and four-year institutions, private and public institutions, large institutions (enrolling 2,000 ore more full- or part-time students) and small institutions (enrolling under 2,000 full- or part-time students), and English departments and speech departments.

Two-year colleges were compared with four-year colleges and universities because it was thought that the community-centered orientation of many two-year colleges and their smaller faculties might affect their adoption of courses and units on persuasion. Private institutions were compared with public institutions and large institutions with small institutions because it was thought that budget limitations and smaller faculty in small and private institutions might limit the amount of attention given to persuasion. English departments were compared with speech departments because these are the two departments which provide the greatest number of students with information about persuasion and because information on their handling of persuasion might be of benefit to teachers in both disciplines. Comparisions were <u>not</u> made on the basis of whether

responding institutions were located in urban, suburban, and rural settings. It was thought that such comparisons might be pointless in our age of mobility. Tables describing the statistical breakdowns of the survey results appear in appendices at the end of this dissertation. What follows here will be a general discussion of some of the findings of the survey.

It should be pointed out here that, while some of the differences which will be discussed in this and the following chapter are not statistically significant, they are worthy of discussion in that they may indicate possible trends in the teaching of persuasion. It should also be noted that, although the discussion will usually be couched in terms of the percentage of respondents in a given category, information on the number of respondents in each category may be found in the tables in Appendices B and C.

1. Does your department offer a course devoted entirely or primarily to the study of persuasion? Yes___; No___

One hundred and thirty-two chairpersons responded to this question. Of this number, 33% responded affirmatively and 67% responded negatively. Thus, for whatever reason, only one-third of the departments surveyed indicated that they devoted a full course to the study of persuasion. Further analysis of the responses revealed that 29% of the small schools offer a course on persuasion, as compared with 36% of the large schools. This statistic is not particularly surprising since larger schools are generally able to offer a wider selection of courses. More four-year institutions (42%) offered courses on persuasion that did two-year institutions (23%). However,

at the same time, slightly more private institutions were found to teach courses on persuasion (37%) than public institutions (31%).

A particularly interesting finding was that 49% of the speech departments indicated that they had course offerings in persuasion, while only 21% of the English departments reported persuasion courses. This better than two to one margin in favor of speech departments is perhaps an indication that speech departments place greater emphasis on practical communication skills while English departments are more concerned with artistic or creative expression; perhaps it is merely a reflection of the fact that modern persuasion is more often spoken than written and the speech department is the traditional home of courses dealing with the spoken word.

2. Is a unit on persuasion contained in one or more of your courses? Yes___; No___

Of the 126 responses to this question, 82% were affirmative and 18% negative. Thus, most departments of speech and English responding did offer a unit on persuasion. It is worth noting that, reversing the pattern of responses to the first question, more departments in two-year colleges were said to offer units on persuasion (87%) than in four-year colleges (77%). However, small schools lagged even further behind large schools on question two than they did on question one. Only 73% of the small schools offered units on persuasion as compared with 88% of the large schools. Though about the same percentage of departments of English (80%) and departments of speech (84%) offered units on persuasion, there was a 14% difference between the percentage of private institutions reporting units on persuasion (74%) and the public institutions reporting such units (88%). Since

question one revealed that more private institutions offer speech and English courses on persuasion than public institutions, this difference may merely reflect the fact that a unit on persuasion is not thought to be necessary if a full course is already offered on the subject.

The term "unit" was deliberately left undefined in this question. Later responses on the department survey revealed that to some chairpersons a unit can mean as little as two days' study, while to others it can encompass the major portion of a semester-long course. The length of time devoted to a "unit" was measured in question eleven on the departmental survey.

Of the 126 responses to both of the first two questions, 13% (seventeen departments) indicated that neither a course nor a unit on persuasion was offered. Though this does not rule out the possibility that persuasion might be touched on incidentally in courses offered by these departments, it would apparently indicate that these departments don't give the topic of persuasion sustained treatment.

3. If not, is the addition of such study being contemplated? Yes___; No___

Twenty-two persons responded to this question, 82% (18) indicating that they did not plan the addition of the study of persuasion and only 18% (4) indicating that they did plan the addition of such study. This response would seem to indicate that the status quo is being maintained to a fairly large extent in the study of persuasion. For the present at least, though concern about public persuasion may be reflected in the content of established courses on persuasion, it is

not resulting in a major expansion in the number of courses or units on persuasion.

4. If so, for what course?_____

The three individuals responding to this question indicated that the addition of the study of persuasion was being contemplated for courses on "Rhetoric of Political Speech," "Persuasive Speaking," and "Freshman Rhetoric."

5. Why is the study of persuasion presently omitted from your curriculum?

The subject is relatively unimportant, given other department priorities_____
The staff is not adequately prepared to teach this subject_____
The subject is not one which commands students' interest_____
Other (please specify)_____

Only eight of the seventeen departments offering neither courses nor units on persuasion answered this question. Five of the eight said they did not offer it because the subject was unimportant; one of the eight said that their staff were not prepared to teach it; one of the eight said that the subject did not command student interest; and one said that the subject was unimportant and did not command student interest. With such a small number of responses, a further breakdown of these figures is pointless. However, it should be noted that all but one of those responding cited deficiencies in the subject matter itself, not the staff, as the reason for excluding the study of persuasion. This would seem to indicate that most of those department chairpersons responding to this question are unlikely to include the study of persuasion among their offerings any time soon.

6. If your department does offer a course on persuasion, list the title(s) of the course(s)._____

Those responding listed 62 titles of courses on persuasion. Of these, 36 contained the term persuasion; 9 were courses on argumentation and debate; 4 were courses on advanced composition; 3 dealt with mass communication or mass media; 2 dealt with logic; 2 dealt with propaganda; and the remaining 6 included a writers' workshop and courses on communication theory, rhetorical theory, extemporaneous public speaking, copy and advertising writing, and the language of protest. The 62 courses appear to have very little in common. Some courses are apparently part of the traditional sequences in speech and English (e.g., advanced composition and argumentation and debate), others are apparently part of sequences of professional preparation (e.g., copy and advertising writing). Only 58% of the courses listed as being devoted "entirely or primarily to the study of persuasion" contain the term "persuasion" in their title, which might indicate that persuasion is often studied in context instead of independently.

7. Is any course on persuasion required by your department? Yes___; (please specify course)_____; for whom required_____; No_____

Of the 42 departments responding to this question, 14 (33%) indicated that a course on persuasion was required. Among those departments offering courses, courses were required far more frequently in four-year institutions (43%) than in two-year institutions (14%), more frequently in private institutions (42%) than in public institutions (26%), more frequently in speech departments (36%) than in English departments (29%), and more frequently in large institutions (37%)

than in small institutions (27%). (Again, these figures are in percentages of those responding who offer courses in persuasion, not in percentages of the total population.)

Of the fourteen departments indicating that courses were required, thirteen indicated for whom they were required. Eleven are required of speech majors only; one is required of secondary education majors only; and one is required of broadcasting majors only. This would suggest that, though courses on persuasion are not usually required, when they are required, they are almost always required in speech rather than English sequences. Thus, it would appear that they are required as preparation for those who are to become professional persuaders or speech teachers.

8. What is the length of the course(s) in persuasion?
   One quarter____; One semester____; Other____

The purpose of this question was to determine how many of the courses in persuasion (if any) were mini-courses lasting less than a complete session. All of the 42 respondents to this question specified that their courses lasted for the full quarter, semester, or trimester.

9. If a unit on persuasion is contained in one or more courses, what is (are) the title(s) of the course(s)?
   _____

Those responding to this question listed 162 titles of courses containing units on persuasion. Of this number, 58 were introductory English courses, 37 were courses on the foundations of communication, 15 were courses on effective speaking, 7 dealt with mass communication, 6 dealt with advanced composition, and others dealt with such topics

as critical thinking, argumentation, business and professional speech, and techniques of prose writing. As was the case with question number six, the most notable aspect of the 162 titles was their variety. Even courses on adolescent literature, modes of humanistic thought, and developmental reading were described as containing units on persuasion. However, it was apparent that five-eights of them were introductory courses in speech and English. Thus, most training which students receive in persuasion occurs in introductory, freshman or sophomore courses.

10. Is (are) the course(s) in which it is contained (a) required course(s)? Yes, all required_____;
Yes, some required_____ (please specify courses)_____;
No, none required_____.

Of the 94 responses to this question, 84% (79) were affirmative and 16% (15) were negative. As was the case with question seven, the courses were required more frequently in large institutions (85%) than in small institutions (81%). However, responses were the reverse of those to question seven in that two-year institutions required the courses slightly more frequently (87%) than did four-year institutions (81%), public institutions required them more frequently (90%) than did private institutions (74%), and English departments required them more frequently (88%) than did speech departments (79%). Thus there is little similarity in the patterns of requiring full courses on persuasion and requiring courses containing units on persuasion. The fact that the vast majority of those responding stated that one or more of their courses containing units on persuasion are required

courses indicates that these may be lower division, introductory English and speech courses. This finding is particularly important in light of the fact that a recent study of "The Introductory Course in Speech Communication in the State of Illinois" by Diana Corley found that this course is required for all students at only 32% of Illinois colleges.[1] It is quite possible that those responding to the present survey took the term "required" to mean "required of any group of students within the institutions, e.g., those majoring in English or speech" rather than "required of all students within the institutions." This might explain the large number of "required" courses listed in responses to this survey as compared to the Corley survey.

11. What length of time is devoted to the study of persuasion? (please specify course)_____
One month____; Two weeks____; One week ____;
Other____.

An analysis of the 104 responses to this question revealed that 46% of the units on persuasion last two weeks or less; 43% last between two weeks and one month; and 11% last more than one month. It is interesting to note that, when broken down by subject matter, these statistics reveal that 34% of the units offered by speech departments last two weeks or less; 47% of the units offered by speech departments last between two weeks and one month; and 19% of the units offered by speech departments last longer than one month. Of the units offered by English departments, 56% last two weeks or less; 40% last between two weeks and one month; and 4% last more than one month. This large

discrepancy indicates that the speech departments surveyed spend more time studying persuasion than do the English departments surveyed, as is already indicated by the responses to questions one, two, and seven.

12. Is a textbook or other commercial material used in the study of persuasion? Yes____; No____.

Of the 101 chairpersons responding to this question, 76% indicated that textbooks or other commercial material were used; 24% indicated they were not. The subcategories all had nearly the same proportions as the sample as a whole. The fact that so many chairpersons did not report using textbooks or other commerical materials in the study of persuasion might indicate either that many teachers use teacher-developed materials for teaching about persuasion or that the chairpersons responding simply did not have at their fingertips the titles or the texts used in their department.

13. If so, which ones?
(Course or unit)_____ (Title)_____
(Publisher)_____

Respondents mentioned some 108 texts in response to this question, 67 in speech courses and 41 in English courses. Of this number, 48 speech texts and 29 English texts were different. With two exceptions, no text was mentioned as being used by more than three English or speech departments in courses or units on persuasion. Five speech departments mentioned using Principles and Types of Speech Communication (Alan H. Monroe and Douglas Ehninger. Glenview, Illinois: Scott Foresman and Co., 1974); eleven English departments mentioned using Writing with a Purpose (James M. McCrimmon. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1973).

In both English and speech departments, many of the texts mentioned are intended for use in introductory, lower division courses. However, while English departments mentioned using only one text with the term "persuasion" in its title (Perception and Persuasion), texts with the term "persuasion" in their title were mentioned sixteen times by speech departments (e.g., Readings in Persuasion, Techniques of Persuasion, and Persuasion: Theory and Practice).

14. Please list the names of those teachers in your department presently teaching a course on persuasion or a course containing a unit on persuasion.

Though some of those responding failed to answer this question in a way which would enable me to send out a follow-up questionnaire, by making a number of telephone calls to those whose answers were incomplete enough names were obtained to justify a second questionnaire survey of teachers of persuasion.

At my request, some chairpersons enclosed copies of their syllabi or course outlines for units and courses on persuasion. These were occasionally helpful in interpreting individual answers to the questionnaire. However, the syllabi were submitted too infrequently and were too sketchy to permit a separate analysis of them.

However, some of the comments made by those responding to the departmental survey are worth discussing at this point. These comments varied a great deal and are, I believe, a good indication of the

variety of attitudes held by English and speech departments toward the study of persuasion. Some comments indicated outright hostility toward the idea of teaching about public persuasion. Chairpersons with this view felt that students should be prepared as persuadees by other departments (e.g., "Why would an English department deal with TV commercials as persuasive devices? This is grist for the psychologists' mill." And "We do teach persuasion, but only as it pertains to literature and student writing -- ours is not a sociology course.") Other chairpersons expressed their personal regret that they were not preparing their students in this area (e.g., "In my opinion we need to do much more than we have been doing." and "We should be offering it. Departmental laziness is the reason we do not.")

Two respondents returned blank questionnaires with a written comment attached that their schools no longer had speech departments ("The president of the college decided that speech was expendable." and "We no longer have a Speech Department."). It was more common for chairpersons to accompany questionnaires with the comment that they themselves couldn't say whether or to what degree persuasion was taught in their departments, since individual instructors determined their own course content (e.g., "Persuasion may be included if an instructor wishes, but it would be individual and not a general offering." "It is taught at the discretion of individual instructor." and "Individual instructors, on their own, may treat persuasion. There is no way I, as chairman of freshman English composition could generalize about that.")

The chairperson of one department in a four-year institution offering neither a course nor a unit on persuasion explained this situation by saying that "Department members are too divided about its importance." The chairperson of a department in a two-year institution explained the absence of a course on persuasion from its curriculum by stating "Because a persuasion course is usually an upper division course, we cannot get state approval to offer it at fresh. and soph. levels." On this last comment, my own investigation revealed that the Illinois Community College Board has granted other two-year institutions permission to offer courses on persuasion and the director of the Board personally assured me of his willingness to continue to authorize such courses.

Summary

A survey of approximately 130 departments of English and speech in the state of Illinois revealed that about one-third of them have at least one course devoted to the study of persuasion, with speech departments outnumbering English departments two to one in this regard. Units on persuasion are offered by 82% of the departments responding, while neither a course nor a unit is offered by 13% of those responding. Though only one-third of those responding said that their courses on persuasion are required, 85% of the courses which are required are required of speech majors only. Units on persuasion are found in courses with many different titles, but five-eighths of these appear to be introductory courses in speech and English. Forty-six percent of the units last two weeks or less, while forty-three percent last between two weeks and one month. Units offered by speech departments last longer than do units offered by English departments, with only 19% of the units offered by speech departments and 4% of the units offered by English departments lasting longer than one month. No uniformity in textbook selection was apparent.

An analysis of these findings as they apply to two-year vs. four-year institutions reveals that nearly twice as many departments in four-year institutions (42%) offer a course on persuasion as departments in two-year institutions (23%) and that among those departments offering courses 43% of those in four-year institutions offer a required course

as compared with only 14% of those in two-year institutions. However, slightly more departments in two-year institutions (87%) offer a unit on persuasion than departments in four-year institutions (77%), and the units are somewhat longer in departments in two-year institutions than in departments in four-year institutions, with 14% of the units in departments in two-year institutions lasting more than a month as compared with only 7% of the units in departments in four-year institutions.

Departments in private institutions offer courses on persuasion only slightly more frequently than departments in public institutions (37% vs. 31%). However, these courses are more likely to be required in private institutions (42%) than public institutions (26%). Units on persuasion are less frequently offered by private institutions (74%) than by public institutions (88%) and are less frequently found in required courses in private institutions (74%) than in public institutions (90%).

Departments in large institutions are slightly more likely to offer courses on persuasion than departments in small institutions (36% vs. 29%); are more likely to require their courses (37% vs. 27%); are more likely to offer a unit on persuasion (88% vs. 73%); and are more likely to have the unit in a required course (85% vs. 81%). Departments in large institutions also spend more time in their units on persuasion than departments in small institutions. Fourteen percent of departments in large institutions spend more than a month in their units on persuasion, as compared with five percent of departments in small

institutions; forty-seven percent of departments in large institutions spend between two weeks and one month in their units on persuasion, as compared with thirty-seven percent of departments in small institutions.

Notes

[1]Diana Corley, "The Introductory Course in Speech Communication in the State of Illinois" (Paper given at the annual meeting of the Illinois Speech and Theatre Association, ED 101 400, November 1974), p. 4.

CHAPTER THREE

A SURVEY OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH AND SPEECH IN ILLINOIS PRESENTLY TEACHING PERSUASION

In order to determine what approaches teachers use in teaching the subject of persuasion, what texts and other materials they use, what aspects they emphasize, and what overall attitudes they have toward the subject of persuasion, a second questionnaire was distributed to those teaching units or courses on persuasion in Illinois institutions of higher education. The principal concern here was to determine to what extent teachers were preparing students as persuadees (vs. persuaders) and also to determine the extent to which teachers were preparing students specifically to deal with the persuasive messages transmitted via the mass media.

This second survey was sent to 315 persons specified in responses to the first questionnaire as teaching persuasion. It was decided that, in order to avoid skewing the survey results in favor of those institutions with large faculties, a maximum of five teachers from each department would be sent questionnaires. Thus, even though a department might list many more as teachers of persuasion, only five persons were queried. Usable responses were received from 102 teachers, approximately 32% of those surveyed.

As was the case with the first questionnaire survey, responses were tabulated for the group as a whole and for eight different subgroups as well. The tables describing these statistical breakdowns appear in Appendix C of this report. A general discussion of some of the findings will follow.

To get an overall picture of the teacher of persuasion in Illinois departments of English and speech, those surveyed were first asked how long they had been teaching, what was the highest degree they had attained, and what had been their area of specialization for their last degree. These questions sought to determine whether the teachers surveyed were experienced professionals with adequate training to teach persuasion or whether they were lacking in either experience or formal training.

Years of Teaching Experience:_____

Of the 96 teachers who responded to this question, 32 indicated that they had had between six and ten years of teaching experience; 20 had between one and five years of experience; 16 had between eleven and fifteen years experience; and the remaining 28 teachers had sixteen or more years of teaching experience (7 of those in this last group indicated that they had taught for 26 years or more). Thus, while those responding to this question had varied amounts of teaching experience, the vast majority of respondents were teachers with more than five years of teaching behind them.

Highest Degree Attained:_____

Of the 100 teachers responding to this question, 60% indicated that their highest degree was the M.A.; 35% indicated that their highest degree was the Ph.D.; and 5% indicated that their highest degree was the Advanced Certificate. When these figures were analyzed in terms of two-year vs. four-year institutions, it was found that 80% of those

responding from two-year colleges had the M.A.; 11% had the Ph.D.; and 9% had the advanced Certificate. In four-year colleges, 37% had the M.A.; 63% had the Ph.D.; and none had the Advanced Certificate. In private colleges too, those holding the Ph.D. outnumbered those with the M.A. (56% vs. 44%). For all other subgroups analyzed, the figures were fairly close to those for the sample as a whole.

Area of specialization for last degree:_____

Of the 89 teachers responding to this question, only one teacher of English and one teacher of speech listed "persuasion" as their area of specialization for their last degree. Of the 55 English teachers responding, 39 listed either "English," an English literary period, or an American literary period as their areas of specialization. Five listed "education" or "English education." Two listed "philosophy" and another two listed "education administration." Areas of specialization listed only once included "modern drama," "persuasion," "journalism," "reading," "science and literature," "religion and literature," and "German literature."

The 34 speech teachers responding listed "speech" as their area of specialization 8 times; "speech communication" or "communication" 5 times; "theatre" or "dramatics" 5 times; "speech education" 4 times; "public address" 3 times; "group communication," "communication theory," and "rhetoric" each twice; and "interpretation," "mass communication," and "intercultrual persuasion" each once.

These figures would seem to indicate that, while those teachers of persuasion who responded did appear to have adequate teaching experience and also an adequate formal education for teaching at institutions of higher education, few had specialized in the subject of persuasion. While this finding is not particularly surprising, it does bring to mind the fact that the training which most English teachers have received in persuasion probably occured in freshman English courses or as an adjunct to the study of literature. Although speech teachers are far more likely to have taken at least one full course devoted solely to the theories and methods of persuasion, it is quite possible for a college teacher of speech to receive an M.A. or even a Ph.D. without having taken such a course.

1. What are your goals or main emphases in your teaching of persuasion?_____

Since responses to this question were in teachers' own words, they did not readily lend themselves to analysis. However, since it was thought that answers to this question might illuminate some of the other answers on the questionnaire, respondents' answers were broken down into 147 goals and emphases. Of this number, 40 involved the construction of persuasive messages and 37 involved the critical reception of persuasive messages; 8 involved the construction of effective arguments and 6 involved the critical reception of arguments; 22 involved training in logic and 7 involved training in psychological or emotional appeals. Other goals which were mentioned were training in ethics (10), writing skills (7),

motivation (4), media reception (4), and propaganda (2).

From these responses, it would appear that teachers of persuasion emphasize the production of persuasive messages slightly more often than the reception of persuasive messages, and that they emphasize the rational elements of persuasion quite a bit more often than the irrational elements. These responses would also lead one to believe that training in the ethics of persuasion is a major goal of only a small percentage of those responding (a finding contradicted by responses to question four). However, the terms used by respondents to describe their goals and emphases are so broad as to make all generalizations based on them highly speculative. Responses to succeeding questions are more easily classified.

2. What length of time do you devote to the study of persuasion?

This question is a duplicate of one asked on the departmental questionnaire. Since the departmental survey covered more schools and elicited a larger percentage of responses, the information from that first survey is probably more applicable to the State of Illinois as a whole. However, the responses to this question do provide information of interest about the teachers responding to this survey.

Of the 97 respondents, 40% indicated that they spend a full quarter or semester on persuasion; 8% indicated that they spend more than one month but less than a quarter studying persuasion; 31% spend between two weeks and one month on persuasion; and 21% spent two weeks or less on persuasion. Respondents in speech departments

spend appreciably more time on persuasion than respondents in English departments (e.g., 54% of respondents in speech departments spend a full quarter or semester on persuasion as compared with 32% of respondents in English departments).

These findings would seem to indicate that those responding to this questionnaire survey are teachers who spend somewhat more time in the teaching of persuasion than is average for the State of Illinois according to the departmental survey. In other words, it would appear that these teachers are more committed than most to the subject of persuasion.

3. In teaching, do you seek to prepare students as persuaders, persuadees, or both?

Of the 102 teachers responding to this question, 13% said that they sought to prepare students as persuaders; 4% said they sought to prepare students as persuadees, and 83% said they sought to prepare students as both. When these figures are broken down for English departments vs. speech departments, it was found that 16% of the respondents in English departments attempted to train students as persuaders (vs. 8% for respondents in speech departments); 5% of respondents in English departments attempted to train students as persuadees (vs. 3% for respondents in speech departments); and 85% of the respondents in English departments attempted to prepare students as both (vs. 89% for speech departments). Although these differences are minimal, responses to 3A provide additional information on this subject.

3A. If both, is preparation for one of the two roles emphasized?

Of the 84 teachers responding to this question, 43% indicated that they emphasized the role of persuasion; 15% indicated that they emphasized the role of persuadee; and 42% indicated that they emphasized both roles equally. When these figures were broken down for English departments vs. speech departments, it was found that 41% of the respondents in English departments emphasized the role of persuader (vs. 46% for respondents in speech departments); 18% of the respondents in English departments emphasized the role of persuadee (vs. 11% for respondents in speech departments); and 41% of the respondents in English departments emphasized both roles equally (vs. 43% for respondents in speech departments).

It is interesting to note that, although teachers in large and small schools were within two percentage points of each other in their responses to question 3, they differed greatly in their responses to question 3A. Analysis revealed that 56% of the respondents in large institutions emphasized the role of persuader (vs. 20% of the respondents in small institutions); 11% of the respondents in large institutions emphasized the role of persuadee (vs. 23% of the respondents in small institutions); and 33% of the respondents in large institutions emphasized both roles equally (vs. 57% of the respondents in small institutions). These findings would appear to indicate that English and speech teachers in small institutions are far more persuadee-oriented than their counterparts in large institutions.

4. How much emphasis is devoted to the follwing aspects of persuasion?
   Advertising Persuasion. . . Argumentation. . . Denotation/ Connotation. . . Ethics of Persuasion. . . Euphemisms. . . Logic. . . Logical Fallacies. . . Nonverbal Persuasion. . . Political Persuasion. . . Propaganda Techniques. . . Persuasion in the Mass Media (Exclusive of Advertising) A. Print Media. . . B. Nonprint Media. . .

There were between 97 and 101 respondents to the various parts of this question. Respondents were asked to indicate whether the amount of their emphasis on the various aspects would best be characterized as "Major," "Minor," or "Little or none." What follows is a rank ordering of the twelve aspects of persuasion according to the percentage of respondents giving "Major" emphasis to them.

1. Argumentation (69%)
2. Logic (61%)
3. Logical Fallacies (57%)
4. Ethics of Persuasion (42%)
5. Advertising Persuasion (37%)
6. Propaganda Techniques (36%)
7. Denotation/Connotation (33%)
8. Persuasion in the Print Media (29%)
9. Persuasion in the Nonprint Media (28%)
10. Political Persuasion (27%)
11. Nonverbal Persuasion (20%)
12. Euphemisms (9%)

It is interesting to note the differences between English and speech teachers in their emphases on these twelve aspects. What follows is a rank ordering of these aspects according to the percentage of respondents in speech and English departments giving "Major" emphasis to them.

Speech

1. Advertising Persuasion (54%)
2. Argumentation (50%)
3. Logic (45%)
4. Propaganda Techniques (45%)
5. Persuasion in the Nonprint Media (43%)
6. Ethics of Persuasion (42%)
7. Logical Fallacies (42%)
8. Political Persuasion (36%)
9. Nonverbal Persuasion (34%)
10. Denotation/Connotation (26%)
11. Persuasion in the Print Media (18%)
12. Euphemisms (0%)

English

1. Argumentation (81%)
2. Logic (71%)
3. Logical Fallacies (66%)
4. Ethics of Persuasion (41%)
5. Denotation/Connotation (37%)
6. Persuasion in the Print Media (35%)
7. Propaganda Techniques (31%)
8. Advertising Persuasion (27%)
9. Political Persuasion (22%)
10. Persuasion in Nonprint Media (18%)
11. Euphemisms (14%)
12. Nonverbal Persuasion (11%)

No general pattern is discernible in the responses of the teachers of speech. The variation between items is relatively small. There is, for example, a difference of only twelve percentage points between the first ranked aspect and the seventh ranked aspect. There are even two pairs of items which received identical rankings. Thus almost all of the twelve aspects are given major emphasis by about the same number of speech teachers.

In contrast, a distinct pattern seems to emerge in the responses of English teachers. Three aspects of persuasion (argumentation, logical fallacies, and logic) are given major emphasis much more

frequently than the remaining nine. (There is, for example, a difference of 50 percentage points between the first ranked aspect and the seventh ranked aspect.) An examination of these three aspects reveals that they reflect the conscious and rational elements of persuasion as opposed to the subconscious and non-rational elements.

5A. As part of their study of persuasion, are students asked to: write persuasive materials geared toward an audience larger than the class itself (e.g., letters to the editor or to political candidates)?

Of the 100 respondents to this question, 52% indicated that they did ask their students to write such persuasive materials. As expected, the teachers of English responded affirmatively more often than the teachers of speech (65% vs. 32%).

5B. As part of their study of persuasion are students asked to: write persuasive materials geared toward other members of the class?

A slightly higher percentage (65%) of the 100 teachers responded affirmatively to this question than to the previous one. Despite the fact that written rather than spoken materials were specified, a larger percentage of speech departments responded affirmatively (68%) than English departments (63%).

5C. As part of their study of persuasion, are students asked to: construct and present persuasive oral persentation?

Of the 99 respondents to this question, 52% indicated that they asked their students to make such presentations. However, 89% of the speech teachers responded affirmatively, while only 28% of the English teachers did so.

5D. As part of their study of persuasion, are students asked to: demonstrate non-verbal techniques for the purpose of persuasion?

Of the 98 teachers responding to this question, 31% answered affirmatively. Half of the speech teachers indicated that they had their students demonstrate non-verbal techniques, as compared with 18% of the English teachers.

The four parts of question five were designed to elicit information about the preparation of Illinois students as persuaders. Responses to question 5A indicated that less than two-thirds of those studying persuasion in English classes are asked to write persuasively for audiences larger than the class itself and less than one-third of those studying persuasion in speech classes were asked to do so. Apparently, many students in Illinois may go through college without ever having been asked to even attempt to write persuasively for anyone other than their teachers and classmates. Responses to question 5B indicated that students of English get only a very little more training in writing persuasively for their classmates. Although the responses to the four parts of question five indicate that teachers of persuasion in speech departments do usually provide their students with experience in persuading others, it should be noted that the oral presentations are likely to involve either persuasion in small group situtions or addressed to imagined large groups. It is usually impossible to provide practice in persuading actual mass audiences.

6. What commercial texts are required for your course or unit on persuasion?

The majority of teachers responding to this questionnaire survey either left this question blank, filled in the word "none," or indicated that they used dittoed or mimeographed copies of their own materials. Thus, it would appear that most of the responding teachers do not make much use of commercial texts in their units or courses on persuasion. However, those who did indicate that they used a commercial text listed some 95 titles, 68 of which were different. Ten responding English teachers indicated that they used Writing with a Purpose. No other text was used by more than two English teachers. Persuasive Communication and Principles of Speech Communication were each employed by four speech teachers. No other text was used by more than two speech teachers.

As was noted on the responses to the departmental questionnaire, many of the texts mentioned are intended for use in introductory, lower division courses. Again, only one English teacher mentioned using a text with the term "persuasion" in its title (The Hidden Persuaders). Fifteen speech teachers mentioned using nine different texts which contain the term "persuasion" in their titles (e.g., Persuasion: Theory and Practice, The Psychology of Persuasive Speaking, and Persuasion: Reception and Responsibility). Of course, the titles of textbooks are not an infallible guide to the content of courses employing them, and texts not bearing the word "persuasion" in their

title may be partially or totally devoted to the subject of persuasion. Nonetheless, as an examination of a sample of the texts confirmed, speech texts were more persuasion-oriented than English texts. A discussion of this examination of speech and English texts will appear at the end of this chapter.

7. How frequently do you use the following supplementary materials in the study of persuasion? Newspaper or Magazine Editorials. . . Newspaper or Magazine Ads. . . Taped or Printed Transcripts of Political Speeches. . . Televised Ads. . . Radio Ads. . . Televised News Commentaries. . . Radio News Commentaries. . .

Between 97 and 101 teachers responded to the various parts of this question. Respondents were asked to indicate whether they used the various supplementary materials "Frequently," "Occasionally," or "Seldom or never." What follows is a rank ordering of the seven types of supplementary materials according to the percentage of respondents making frequent use of them.

1. Newspaper or Magazine Ads (31%)
2. Televised Ads (26%)
3. Newspaper or Magazine Editorials (22%)
4. Taped or Printed Transcripts of Political Speeches (18%)
5. Televised News Commentaries (10%)
6. Radio Ads (6%)
7. Radio News Commentaries (1%)

When these figures are broken down for teachers in speech and English departments, they reveal the following rank orderings:

Speech

1. Newspaper or Magazine Ads (37%)
2. Televised Ads (34%)
3. Taped or Printed Transcripts of Political Speeches (29%)
4. Newspaper or Magazine Editorials (18%)
5. Radio Ads (8%)

6. Televised News Commentaries (3%)
7. Radio News Commentaries (0%)

English
1. Newspaper or Magazine Ads (27%)
2. Newspaper or Magazine Editorials (24%)
3. Televised Ads (21%)
4. Televised News Commentaries (15%)
5. Taped or Printed Transcripts of Political Speeches (11%)
6. Radio Ads (5%)
7. Radio News Commentaries (2%)

More teachers in both speech and English departments made frequent use of materials from newspapers, magazines, and television than from radio. Twice as many English teachers made frequent use of printed (27%) and televised ads (21%) as made frequent use of political speeches (11%). No such major distinction was apparent among speech teachers. While these figures also indicate that more speech teachers make frequent use of mass media materials in general than English teachers, perhaps the most noteworthy finding is that so few teachers of persuasion in either speech or English make frequent use of mass media materials in their classes. Nearly three quarters of the English teachers responding and nearly two-thirds of the speech teachers responding used these supplementary materials only occasionally, seldom, or never. Part of the reason why so little use is made of television and radio may lie in the practical problems involved in bringing broadcast messages into the classroom. However, many teachers own portable radios, televisions, and tape recorders; many schools have both tape recording and videotape recording equipment available for teachers' use. Perhaps the real problem lies in a lack not of equipment

but of experience using it in the classroom setting.

8. Which of the following terms best describes your overall approach to the study of persuasion? Rhetorical____; General Semantics____; Linguistics____; Other____

The 99 teachers responding to this question indicated that they espoused a variety of pedagogical approaches. The rhetorical approach was adopted by 69% of the respondents, the general semantics approach by 10% of the respondents, the linguistic approach by 2% of the respondents, and various other approaches (or combinations of the three approaches listed on the questionnaire) by 19% of the respondents.

In order to determine the emphases conveyed in the textbooks employed by Illinois teachers of speech and English, a sample of the texts mentioned in response to question six of this survey was examined. Although this examination was not exhaustive, it did reveal a tremendous diversity in the texts now being employed by Illinois teachers.

The most popular text among English teachers of persuasion was Writing with a Purpose by James M. McCrimmon (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1973, 481 pp.). This is an introductory composition text first published in 1950. In his introduction to the fifth edition, the author indicates that he has changed the book in order to give greater attention to the prevailing interests and preoccupations of students. However, he apparently does not consider public persuasion through the mass media to be among these interests and preoccupations, since the index reveals that he has devoted no space whatsoever to newspapers, radio, television, or the mass media in general.

Attention is devoted to the topic of persuasion in the last of the thirteen chapters in the book, 39 pages in all. The purpose of this chapter is apparently to prepare students to write persuasive essays. To achieve this end, the author analyzes the nature of persuasion and the modes of persuasion (persuasion through trustworthiness, persuasion through argument, and persuasion through emotional appeal), and then devotes the bulk of the chapter to a discussion of the techniques of logical argument and the logical fallacies. One page is devoted to the subject of persuasion through emotional appeal.

This examination would appear to indicate that Writing with a Purpose is solely persuader-oriented, with applications to the student as persuadee only by extension. It also appears to follow the traditional orientation of English instruction in that it views persuasion as primarily a rational, logical process. It takes no notice whatsoever of developments in communications technology which have occured in recent centuries nor does it review modern psychological insights into public persuasion. Instead, it approaches the study of persuasion as a subdivision of written communication parallel to expository writing.

Brief analyses of six other texts used by teachers of persuasion in Illinois English departments will indicate their diversity in both content and approach to the study of persuasion.

Modern Rhetoric. By Cleanth Brooks and Robert Penn Warren. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1972 (shorter third edition), 440pp.

Chapter seven of this text, twenty pages in length, is devoted to "Persuasion." Beginning with an analysis of the distinction between argument and persuasion, the chapter first discusses the persuader's identification with his or her audience, then treats the psychological elements of persuasion, emotional appeals, connotation and metaphor, rationalization, reasoning for assent, and ethics.

The concern of this chapter is the writing of themes embodying the principles of persuasion. However, students are asked, in one exercise, to find examples in editorials, articles, and advertisements of certain persuasive techniques, and are told elsewhere that "What is important for you is to cultivate your awareness of the psychological appeals of literature and to study its techniques of persuasion. You should scrutinize your own responses, in your reading and in your daily life."[1] An extensive quote from Vance Packard's The Hidden Persuaders is used to describe the persuasive techniques of Madison Avenue and several quotes from political speeches are provided or suggested for analysis.

Harbrace College Reader. Edited by Mark Schorer, Philip Durham, and Everett L. Jones. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1972, fourth edition, 608pp.

Written to introduce students to "the hard discipline of intelligent reading and careful writing," this reader contains 62 essays grouped under eleven headings. Under the fourth heading, "Persuading Other People," five essays are offered for analysis: "Female Biology in a Male Culture" by Diana Trilling, "Cocksure Women and Hensure Men" by D. H. Lawrence, "A Generation in Search of a Future" by George Wald, "In Defense of Editing" by Norman Podhoretz, and "Letter to Morley Callaghan" by Maxwell Perkins. These 35 pages of text also contain questions intended to stimulate student analysis of the passages presented. In a "Rhetorical Table of Contents" for this book, a total of eleven essays are listed under the heading "Argument and Persuasion." (Strangely enough, one of the essays contained in the chapter on persuasion is omitted from this list.)

Read On, Write On. Edited by Rayna Kline, Georgia-Mae Gallivan, and Stanley Spicer. New York: Random House, Inc., 1971, 455pp.

This collection of readings is in distinct contrast to the reader described above. Designed not to elevate the tastes of the students reading it but rather to provide them with writing models which they can understand and emulate, the essays selected for inclusion in the

text are short and, usually, current, while the discussion questions are designed to encourage student discovery. Two of the nine chapters deal with persuasion: "Persuasion" and "Persuasion--Fair or Unfair"--128 pages in length. "Persuasion" contains 21 essays on germ warfare, civil rights, capital punishment, automobile sales, the draft, train scheduling, Black English, cosmetics advertising, etc. "Persuasion--Fair or Unfair" contains 21 essays on the environment, law and order, nuclear warfare, reactions to college students, and poverty. This last chapter also contains five "public service" advertisements and four cartoons which are analyzed for their persuasive techniques.

The Elements of Style. By William Strunk, Jr. and E. B. White. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1972, second edition, 78pp.

Four chapters, dealing with "Elementary Rules of Usage," "Elementary Principles of Composition," "A Few Matters of Form," and "Words and Expressions Commonly Misused," provide rules and principles issued in the form of sharp commands. A final chapter, "An Approach to Style," contains 21 "suggestions and cautionary hints," to help beginning writers find a satisfactory style. Nothing in the book deals specifically with persuasion, though it might be said that following the advice offered by this book would eliminate infelicities of expression and thus improve one's efficiency as a persuader in certain writing situations.

Clear Thinking. By Hy Ruchlis. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1962, 307pp.

This text is designed for use in an introductory course on logic. Its nine chapters deal with "The Importance of Clear Thinking," "Science Versus Superstition," "Logical Reasoning," "Language and Reasoning," "Missing Facts," "Common Errors in Reasoning," "The Nature of Opinions," "Molding Opinions," and "Advertising." The last two chapters in particular deal with the analysis of public persuasion. They contain sections on comparing newspaper reporting, analyzing editorials, slanting, card-stacking, emotional appeals, bandwagon and testimonials, stereotypes, and ten advertising techniques.

Telling Writing. By Ken Macrorie. New York: Hayden Book Company, Inc., 1970, 270pp.

This text presents a "New" English writing program. It is designed to provide students with a one-year course in writing which will encourage them in a "constant reaching for truth." Models of successful and unsuccessful writing are drawn from papers by students who studied the program described in this text. Examples of successful writing by professional writers are interspersed as well. The 23 sections of the book deal with such topics as tightening, telling facts, criticizing, repeating, keeping a journal, writing critically, sharpening, paraphrasing, and observing conventions.

There is no section on the writing of persuasion, though it might be inferred that a student who followed the program outlined in this text would be a better writer and therefore a more efficient persuader.

Of the texts used by teachers of persuasion in departments of speech, one of the most popular was Persuasive Communication by Erwin P. Bettinghaus (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968, 308pp.). According to the author, "This study describes the process of persuasive communication in many different situations and analyzes communication sources, messages, and channels and their influence on the behavior of audiences. . .The basic approach taken in this book is behavioral, and the basic data is derived from an analysis of the literature of the behavioral sciences."[2]

This text is designed for use in courses in persuasive speaking, management communication, and related fields. It describes theoretical approaches developed for portions of the persuasive process and applies them to the problems facing the persuasive communicator. Its three parts deal with "The People in Persuasion," "Sources, Messages, and Channels," and "People Together." An eight-page epilogue deals with the ethics of persuasion.

While this book is obviously designed to prepare students as persuaders rather than as persuadees, and while it also lacks a mass media orientation, it is devoted solely to persuasive communication and much of the material which it presents could be applied by

extension to the student as persuadee. However, it would appear that the book's main emphasis is on interpersonal communication.

The following brief analyses of six additional books used by teachers of persuasion in speech departments will reveal something of the diversity of the approaches which they employ. Only one of the texts is designed specifically to prepare students as persuadees, although all of the texts reviewed here have applications to the reception of persuasion.

Rudy's Red Wagon: Communication Strategies in Contemporary Society. By Irving J. Rein. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1972. (160pp.)

"This book is about how the powerful and the powerless, through strategy and tactics at their disposal, battle for the distribution of power. . . . The intent of this book is to analyze some of the means and their effect in persuading groups of people to espouse one cause or another, or to take a particular course of action."[3] The three sections of the book deal with "How They Do It," "How They Say It," and "How They Make It." 'They' include car salesmen, dissenters, blockbusters, minorities, record promoters, teachers and students, film makers, and writers of graffiti.

The Process of Social Influence: Readings in Persuasion. Edited by Thomas D. Beisecker and Donn W. Parson. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972. (499pp.)

"This book is an attempt to synthesize primarily experimental studies of the process of social influence. . . . In this book we attempt to pull together material from several disciplines to provide a more cohesive picture of factors involved in persuasion."[4] The four sections of this book deal with the psychological context, properties of source credibility, factors of message construction which influence the persuasiveness of the message, and the residual effects of the persuasive message. (This book is probably best suited for upper division courses.)

Persuasion: Reception and Responsibility. By Charles U. Larson. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1973. (253pp.)

A book designed to help students become "alert and critical persuadees so that we can responsibly practice the reception of persuasive messages."[5] It attempts to present a series of analytical tools, which may be used to judge the persuasion aimed at students. Ten chapters deal with "The Study of Persuasion," "Language and Persuasion," "Tools for Analysis of Language," "Process Premises for Persuasion," "Content Premises in Persuasion," "Societal and Cultural Predispositions to Persuasion," "The Persuasive Campaign or Movement,"

"Case Studies of Campaigns and Movements," "Perspectives on Ethics in Persuasion," and "The Role of the Persuadee in a Mass Society." This is the only text I know of which was written specifically to enable students in introductory courses to understand the complexities of modern persuasion, and thus prepare themselves as persuadees.

Fundamentals of Debate: Theory and Practice. By Otto F. Bauer. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1966 (134pp.).

"Fundamentals of Debate: Theory and Practice is designed specifically for the high-school or college student who is interested in competitive debating. It provides brief, concise discussion of principles and ample opportunity for practical application of the principles."[6] The book's seven chapters deal with "Basic Principles of Educational Debate," "Organizing the Affirmative Case," "Organizing the Negative Case," "Supporting the Case: Evidence and Reasoning," "Attack and Defense: Refutation and Rebuttal," "The Debate: Composition and Delivery," and "Judging a Debate."

Introduction to Communication Theory and Practice. By Kenneth A. Andersen. Menlo Park, California: Cummings Publishing Company, 1972 (309pp.).

This text draws on research findings in rhetorical theory, linguistics, psychology, and sociology to give students a broad perspective on communication theory. "Practical guidelines are

provided as well, to aid students in developing a general understanding of the subject matter while acquiring specific skills and increasing their effectiveness as communicators."[7] Chapter thirteen (24 pages long) is entitled "Audience Communication: Persuasion." Its subsections deal with the nature of persuasion, strategy in delivering persuasive messages, and "special situations" (i.e., argumentation and debate, the friendly audience, the hostile audience, the neutral audience).

Persuasion: The Theory and Practice of Manipulative Communication. By George N. Gordon. New York: Hastings House, Publishers, 1971 (558pp.).

This extensive work is written as "a reconstruction of the entire issue of persuasion as a social activity. . ."[8] It contains five sections: "Backgrounds" deals with the nature and history of communication. "Logical Perspectives" discusses the influence of technology on persuasion; the mass culture as persuasion; the making of a consumer; political persuasion; education, indoctrination, and training; persuasion in the service of nationalism; and persuasion and religion. "Psychological Perspectives" deals with motivation; attitudes, opinions, and beliefs; the power of fear; the power of sex; the power of love; the power of laughter; and the power of power. "Contemporary Dynamics" deals with persuasion and women, youth, violence, blacks, censorship, etc. And "Humanistic Persuasion" contains sections on "Persuasion and Prophecy" and "Persuasion and Survival."

Summary

This survey of approximately 100 teachers of English and speech in institutions of higher education in the state of Illinois was designed to solicit information about their teaching on the subject of persuasion. It was found that the majority of teachers responding had been teaching for more than five years and had received either a masters, if they taught in a two-year college, or a doctorate, if they taught in a four-year institution. The training of students as critical receivers of persuasion (persuadees) was the main goal of only 4% of the teachers surveyed, while 13% said that they sought to prepare students for both roles. Of this last group, 43% indicated that they emphasized the role of persuaders; 15% emphasized the role of persuadee; and 42% emphasized both roles equally. When asked to indicate which of twelve aspects of persuasion received major emphasis in their courses, twice as many teachers of English cited argumentation, logic, and logical fallacies as cited propaganda techniques, advertising persuasion, and political persuasion. Teachers of speech were more evenly distributed in giving major emphasis to the twelve aspects, but the largest percentage gave major empahsis to advertising persuasion, argumentation, logic, and propaganda techniques.

Teachers surveyed mentioned using 68 different texts in the teaching of persuasion, only one of which (Writing with a Purpose) was used by as many as ten respondents. An analysis of a sample of

these texts revealed a great diversity in content and approaches, but speech texts were more likely to concentrate on the subject of persuasion while English texts were more likely to devote a chapter or less to this subject. Supplementary materials from the mass media themselves were used frequently by only slightly more than one quarter of the English teachers responding and by only slightly more than one third of the speech teachers responding.

An analysis of these findings as they apply to two-year vs. four-year institutions reveals that the largest percentage of responding teachers in two-year institutions (41%) spend two weeks to a month studying persuasion, while the largest percentage of responding teachers in four-year institutions (51%) spend a full semester or quarter in the study of persuasion. Although teachers in two-year and four-year institutions are in substantial agreement regarding the amount of attention they give to the training of students as persuaders and persuadees, they do differ somewhat in the emphasis they devote to specific aspects of persuasion: 82% of the teachers in two-year institutions devote major attention to argumentation, as compared with 54% of the teachers in four-year institutions; 65% of the teachers in two-year institutions devote major attention to logical fallacies, as compared with 47% of the teachers in four-year institutions; 20% of the teachers in two-year institutions devote major attention to political persuasion, as

compared with 36% of the teachers in four-year institutions; and 35% of the teachers in two-year institutions devote major attention to ethics, as compared with 50% of the teachers in four-year institutions. More teachers in two-year institutions (71%) ask students to write persuasive materials geared toward other members of the class then do teachers in four-year institutions (58%). And more teachers in two-year institutions (57%) ask students to construct and present oral presentations than do teachers in four-year institutions (44%). Twice as many teachers in two-year colleges (42%) frequently use newspaper or magazine ads in the study of persuasion as teachers in four-year colleges (1o%); but over four times as many teachers in four-year colleges (30%) frequently use taped or printed transcripts of political speeches as teachers in two-year colleges (7%).

Teachers of persuasion in private institutions are more than twice as likely to hold the doctrate as teachers of persuasion in public institutions (56% vs. 25%). However, teachers of persuasion in public institutions are more likely to place major emphasis on advertising in their teaching than are teachers in private institutions (41% vs. 28%) and are more likely to make frequent use of newspaper or magazine ads in the study of persuasion than are teachers in private institutions (37% vs. 17%). Those in private institutions are more likely to place major empasis on political persuasion than are those in public institutions (39% vs. 23%).

Teachers of persuasion in large institutions spend more time on the study of persuasion than their counterparts in small institutions. For example, 44% of the teachers in large institutions spend a full semester or quarter on persuasion, as compared to 32% of the teachers in small institutions. Although teachers in large and small institutions are in substantial agreement in their responses to the first question inquiring whether they prepare students as persuaders or persuadees, of those who said they prepared students as both, twice as many teachers in large institutions (56% vs. 20%) emphasized the role of persuader, while twice as many teachers in small institutions (23% vs. 11%) emphasized the role of persuadee. On specific aspects of persuasion, those in large institutions were more likely to place major emphasis on advertising persuasion than those in small institutions (43% vs. 27%); were more likely to place major emphasis on political persuasion than those in small institutions (32% vs. 19%); and were less likely to place major emphasis on argumentation than those in small institutions (19% vs. 32%). Teachers in large institutions were also more likely to make use of taped or printed transcripts of political speeches in their study of persuasion than were teachers in small schools (23% vs. 8%). Finally, teachers in large schools were less likely to describe their overall approach as solely rhetorical (58% vs. 80%) and more likely to use a combination of approaches.

Notes

[1]Cleanth Brooks and Robert Penn Warren, Modern Rhetoric (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1972), p. 184.

[2]Erwin P. Bettinhaus, Persuasive Communication (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968), p. v.

[3]Irving J. Rein, Rudy's Red Wagon: Communication Strategies in Contemporary Society (Glenview, Ill.: Scott Foresman and Company, 1972), p. 3.

[4]Thomas D. Beisecker and Donn W. Parsons, eds., The Process of Social Influence: Readings in Persuasion (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972), p. v.

[5]Charles U. Larson, Persuasion: Reception and Responsibility (Belmont, Cal.: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1973), p. 242.

[6]Otto F. Bauer, Fundamentals of Debate: Theory and Practice (Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1966), from the preface, n. pag.

[7]Kenneth A. Andersen, Introduction to Communicaton Theory and Practice (Menlo Park, Cal.: Cummings Publishing Company, 1972), p. v.

[8]George N. Gordon, Persuasion: The Theory and Practice of Manipulative Communication (New York: Hastings House, Publishers, 1971), p. ix.

CHAPTER FOUR

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In October 1974, I conducted a questionnaire survey of departments of English and speech in Illinois institutions of higher education in order to determine the extent to which students were being taught about public persuasion (e.g., politics, advertising, news media, and the like). In March 1975, I conducted a second questionnaire survey of teachers of persuasion in Illinois junior colleges, colleges, and universities, a survey which attempted to determine the extent to which these teachers were preparing students to deal with the persuasive messages they received via the mass media. These surveys were undertaken because I strongly suspected that students were receiving extensive training to prepare them as persuaders but were receiving little training to prepare them as "persuadees," critical receivers of mass media persuasion.

The surveys confirmed my suspicions. According to the first survey, only one-third of the responding departments even offer a course on persuasion and only one-third of these courses are required. However, units on persuasion are offered by more than four-fifths of the departments responding and over four-fifths of the units are found in required courses. Five-eighths of these units appear to be offered in introductory courses and nearly half of them last two weeks or less. Only 11% of the units last more than a month.

On the second survey, although over four-fifths of the responding teachers of persuasion indicated that they prepared students as both persuaders and persuadees, these same teachers were nearly three times as likely to emphasize the role of persuader as they were to emphasize the

role of persuadee. Of twelve aspects of persuasion which teachers were asked to rate, only three were rated as receiving "major emphasis" by more than half of the responding teachers: argumentation, logic, and logical fallacies. Among the aspects receiving major emphasis by less than half of the responding teachers were: advertising persuasion (37%), ethics of persuasion (42%), and political persuasion (27%). Texts cited as used in the study of persuasion were many and varied and employed diverse approaches to the subject. However, some devoted no space whatsoever to mass media or persuasion *per se*, while others rendered these topics only the most perfunctory attention. Supplementary materials from the mass media themselves were cited as being used frequently in the study of persuasion by less than a third of the responding teachers.

The surveys also revealed that English departments offered fewer courses on persuasion and spent less time on persuasion in the units which they offered on it. English teachers were about half as likely to devote major emphasis to advertising persuasion as speech teachers and were also far less likely to devote major emphasis to political persuasion than speech teachers. Despite the reputation of English teachers for concern about language, the survey revealed that they were less likely to make frequent use of newspaper or magazine ads, taped or printed transcripts of political speeches, or televised ads than speech teachers.

Although I cannot claim to have been surprised by these findings, as a teacher of English I did find them somewhat disheartening. . . especially at a time when political chicanery is a widely practiced art and annual advertising expenditures are fast approaching the thirty billion dollar mark. It appears that Richard Lloyd-Jones was all too accurate in his comment that "The functions of language which we (writing teachers) taught were to report accurately an external world and perhaps to persuade, although we often left the latter function for programs in public relations, advertising, journalism or speech."[1]

Perhaps the only bright spot in the otherwise bleak picture painted by the two Illinois surveys is the discovery that considerable emphasis is being given to the study of the rational elements of persuasion (i.e., logic, logical fallacies, and argument), especially by departments of English. However, one wonders whether even this silver cloud might not have a sable lining. Does training in logical analysis equip students to analyze today's public persuasion? In order to discover a logical fallacy in an argument, one must first have an argument which has a logical form and approach. My own personal perception of modern public persuasion is that it contains little or no such logical patterning. If this perception is accurate, it does not mean that training in logic and logical analysis is wasted on the study of public discourse. However, it does suggest that such training should be supplemented if we wish to prepare students to deal with public persuasion by advertisers and with modern political persuasion based on the techniques of commercial advertising.

Cleanth Brooks and Robert Penn Warren draw a distinction between argument and persuasion in that "the former is based on logic, the latter on psychology."[2] They go on to say that "The end of argument, strictly conceived, is truth--truth as perceived by the operation of reason. The end of persuasion, on the other hand, is assent--assent to the will of the persuader."[3] While this distinction is one which might be bitterly debated among those who responded to my surveys, it is one which merits consideration. If this distinction is heeded, the study of truth and how truth may be arrived at, the study of reasoning (i.e., logic) is the proper basis for an understanding of argument; but the study of the attitudes, motives, and behaviors of individuals and groups (i.e., psychology) is the proper basis for an understanding of persuasion. Both argument and persuasion are worthy subjects for students' attention. And, since elements of argument and persuasion are commonly intertwined in human communication, it may be well to study them conjointly. However, one should not assume that providing students with training in psychology will prepare them for argumentation. Nor should one assume, as apparently a great many teachers do, that providing students with training in logic will prepare them for persuasion.

This distinction assumes greater importance in light of the fact that public discourse is becoming increasingly oriented toward persuasion rather than argumentation. Politicians have assumed the persuasive

strategies of commercial advertisers (see Joe McGinniss's The Selling of the President 1968, Gene Wyckoff's The Image Candidates: American Politics in the Age of Television, and Dan Nimmo's The Political Persuaders: The Techniques of Modern Election Campaigns). And, under pressure by the Federal Trade Commission and consumer groups to put an end to false advertising which made claims which were factually inaccurate or logically invalid, advertisers themselves are relying less on logical argument and more on psychological persuasion. In the words of one advertiser, "Specific claims can be argued on the basis of facts. Logic can be questioned. . . . But, it is difficult to challenge image, emotion, style (whatever you want to call it). Therefore, agencies and advertisers are turning to the image approach because it is 'safer.'"[4] This triumph of persuasion over argument in American advertising is dealt with in some depth in Ivan Preston's The Great American Blow-Up: Puffery in Advertising and Selling, which describes how the ordered, sequential, rational sales pitch has been replaced by puffery and simple association techniques.

If, then, the language of the political arena and the language of the marketplace is geared toward persuasion, it would seem appropriate to direct students' attention to public persuasion in the language classroom. There are, of course, other avenues of communication besides the mass media and other forms of communication besides public persuasion. These too must receive proper attention in the language classroom.

However, the enormous power which public persuasion wields in shaping the beliefs, attitudes, and actions of students, for good or ill, dictates that this subject ought no longer receive only brief and passing attention in the curriculum. If, as was recently estimated, the average American family has its television set on about six hours every day,[5] and if, as is apparently the case, television and the other mass media are being used with increasing effectiveness to persuade Americans about which candidates to support, which products to buy, which causes to espouse, and even, indirectly, which values to hold, the American educational system would be derelict were it to continue in its present hit-or-miss fashion to prepare students to cope with public persuasion.

The National Council of Teachers of English acknowledged the need to prepare students as receivers of public persuasion by passing two resolutions in 1971. The first of these resolved that "the National Council of Teachers of English find means to study dishonest and inhumane uses of language and literature by advertisers, to bring offenses to public attention, and to propose classroom techniques for preparing children to cope with commercial propaganda." The second resolved that "the National Council of Teachers of English find means to study the relation of language to public policy, to keep track of, publicize, and combat semantic distortion by public officials, candidates for office, political commentators, and all those who transmit through the mass media." In November 1972, the National Council of Teachers of English

authorized the formation of a Committee on Public Doublespeak to implement these resolutions.

The National Council of Teachers of English is not the only professional organization of educators concerned about public persuasion. In December 1973 the Speech Communication Association authorized the formation of a Committee on Responsibility/Accountability in Governmental Communication, a committee founded to "inform the general public of the existence and seriousness of the problem (of breeches in governmental responsibility/accountability) and to suggest possible remedies." In August 1974 the Association for Education in Journalism passed a motion urging that "journalism programs that have not done so develop courses for non-majors designed to enhance their understanding of the role of press in a democratic society and to help them become better informed consumers of the mass media." And in December 1972, in his presidential address to the Linguistic Society of America at its annual meeting, Dwight Bolinger described some of the linguistic features of the lies told by politicians and advertisers and he encouraged linguists to assume their responsibility to analyze this public language and thus prepare the public to deal with it. As an indication of the international dimensions of the problem of public persuasion, the Canadian Council of Teachers of English is now setting up a committee to work out guidelines for the training of English and language arts teachers in methods of teaching about public doublespeak.

These various statements, resolutions, and committees are indicative of a growing concern among educational leaders about the misuse of public language and the effects of such misuse on students. The NCTE Committee on Public Doublespeak alone contains some 45 members from all across the United States. As chairman of this committee for the past two years, I have received well over 1,000 letters from teachers who wish to prepare their students to cope with public persuasion.

In the comments regarding public persuasion which have been voiced by leaders of the educational community and expressed in the resolutions of professional educational organizations we can note a mounting concern that students be trained as receivers of such persuasion. However, several questions about this training merit investigation, the first among these being, "When should training about public persuasion begin?" I would contend that it should begin as soon as children first enter school, by which time children have already spent a considerable amount of time as the impressionable objects of televised persuasion. According to a study by Jimmie Ellis Cook, eight to ten year old children "can be made aware of commercial propaganda emanating from television and recognize the inherent dangers built into this force that permeates most American homes."[6] Although further research needs to be done in this area, Cook's pioneering study suggests that quite young children can benefit from training in critical listening if they are given the opportunity. Older students, in junior and senior high school and in

junior college and beyond, should have the opportunity to refine and extend the skills which they have acquired in elementary school.

A second question which merits investigation is "Who should be responsible for training students as receivers of public persuasion?" At present, college courses or units on this subject may be found in departments of speech, journalism, anthropology, psychology, communication, etc., each of which can present good and valid reasons why the study of public persuasion is within their purview. I shall not attempt here to disprove any of these claims. However, I shall suggest that departments of English have a unique claim of their own based upon their responsibility for instructing students in the workings of language and other symbol systems. Because of English teachers' expertise in this area, it is especially appropriate that they acquaint students with the ways in which symbols may be used to mold the attitudes and opinions of others. The complex ways in which visual and aural, verbal and nonverbal symbols may be intertwined in order to evoke a desired psychological response has long been a concern of teachers of language, literature, and writing. The dawning of the age of the mass media serves only to cast a new light on this ageless subject.

The expertise of teachers in other departments ought not be overlooked. Although I recognize the difficulties inherent in interdisciplinary courses and programs, such courses and programs are especially attractive in an area which is the focus of so much mutual interest. If such extensive inter-departmental cooperation is impossible, English

departments would do well to at least acquaint themselves with the offerings in related disciplines and benefit from whatever contributions teachers in other departments can make to English courses and units on public persuasion. In envisioning the direction in which the teaching of English should develop, I keep recalling a remark which Walker Gibson made at the 1973 annual convention of the National Council of Teachers of English in Philadelphia. In describing the need which he saw for changing and enlarging the role of the English teacher at all levels, Gibson said "If we are to survive as a profession, if we are to serve our society in a useful way, it will not be because we've refined our teaching of Walter Scott or even William Faulkner. It will be because we've directed our attention, as experts in symbol systems, to the ways language works in the society."[7] I wholeheartedly agree, both with the warning that to ignore the needs of our students is to condemn our profession to stagnation and with the contention that we can make our greatest contribution to our society and to our students through the study of the ways people use symbol systems and the ways people are used by others through symbol systems. I can envision no loftier goal for the English teaching profession than to help students understand the conscious and unconscious ways in which people manipulate symbols in order to communicate information, produce works of aesthetic beauty, attain greater self-understanding, and bring others to think and act as they do.

I see in this goal a far broader responsibility for English teachers than that of literary arbiter elegantiae. I see instead a discipline which would encompass the study of reading and writing, speaking and listening, and the production and viewing of visual and audiovisual materials; which would, in fact, unify all aspects of the symbolic process, both productive and receptive. I see a curriculum which would provide for the real needs of the students taking it; needs not only for a heightened aesthetic sensibility but for a heightened capacity to understand the production and reception of symbolic communication. And I see future students better informed about how symbolic processes influence their attitudes, beliefs, and actions.

At present, as responses to my survey of Illinois teachers confirm, the academic training of those teaching courses or units on persuasion in departments of English is mainly in English or American literature. Some teachers with such a background may be unduly concerned that their background does not prepare them to deal with public persuasion. Although I would agree that it would be well to train teachers specifically to teach about the mass media and about persuasion, training in literature and literary analysis provides teachers with many skills useful in analyzing public persuasion. When analyzing literature, teachers frequently explore with their students the persuasive elements involved in the works before them. As science fiction writer Poul Anderson writes, "Everybody views the world from his particular philosophical platform.

Hence any writer who tries to report what he sees is, inevitably, propagandizing. But as a rule the propaganda lies below the surface."[8]

Occasionally, of course, the propaganda lies on the surface instead of below it. When studying Jonathan Swift's "A Modest Proposal," Gerhart Hauptmann's "The Weavers," Upton Sinclair's The Jungle, Erich Maria Remarque's All Quiet on the Western Front, George Orwell's 1984, or Eldridge Cleaver's Soul on Ice, one cannot avoid confronting the author's persuasive techniques. But more often, as Anderson suggests, the author's persuasive purpose is not so obvious. When this is the case teachers, exploring below the surface of the books they study with their students, attempt to reveal the elements of "propaganda" or persuasion and determine whence they derive their persuasive power. They also discuss whether the author has persuaded well or poorly, and sometimes even discuss whether the ends for which the persuasion was employed were worthwhile. Study of such matters cannot but benefit students when they turn their attention from traditional literary study to persuasive messages broadcast on radio and television or printed in magazines and newspapers.

It is to be hoped that teachers will use these critical skills to venture beyond the study of traditional literature. As William D. Boutwell writes, "The logic is clear: Teachers know the rules of fiction; mass media are largely made up of fiction; ergo, teachers can apply their knowledge and insight regarding the ground rules of fiction to the

understanding and measurement of fiction in mass media."[9] Teachers should direct the critical skills which they use in studying literature to public persuasion transmitted through the mass media, enabling their students to become as critical consumers of television and radio messages as they are of literature.

Such a shift from traditional "literacy" to a new "media literacy" is not a simple one, nor am I attempting to oversimplify the matter. It involves more than just the joining of oral, aural, and pictorial literacy to print literacy. As Annelle Houk and Carlotta Bogart pointed out, the new literacy may be defined as "the individual's assertion of his power over his behavior--his refusal to permit his behavior to be modified without his conscious acquiescence. Literacy is independent behavior consciously shaping and being shaped by media of all kinds."[10] It may be difficult for some teachers to accept such a definition of literacy when their entire professional training has been in traditional literary study. However, it should be pointed out that, just as traditional literary study can be of benefit when one turns one's attention to the mass media; so media study can be of benefit to the study of traditional literature. As Walter J. Ong has written, "Any kind of genuine sensitivity to literature of any age or culture has become thoroughly impossible unless a person has grown seriously, not phrenetically-reflective about contemporary communications media."[11] Thus, the study of public persuasion, while of importance to the student

caught up in a media environment, also serves the literary scholar. The study of mass media is not a threat to the study of literature but a necessary adjunct to it. In the words of Michael F. Shugrue, "The book is in no danger in the English classroom when the teacher and his students view a film, watch a play, or study the language of television."[12] As Shugrue also points out, "In the English class (the student) has an opportunity to examine the uses of language in his society and the ways in which the media attempt to manipulate his emotions and his opinions. If the English teacher ignores the opportunity to discuss the uses of language in the media in order to teach one more poem by William Wordsworth, he has reduced English in modern society to an irrelevancy."[13]

In order to facilitate the shift from literacy to media literacy, future teachers of English at all levels should be trained about public persuasion. Much of this training would merely involve implementing guidelines which have already been drawn up regarding the training of English teachers. For example, the training of elementary and secondary English teachers would benefit enormously were all teacher training institutions to implement guideline four of the "Guidelines for the Preparation of Teachers of English" drawn up by the English Teacher Preparation Study of 1967. That guideline reads: "The teacher of English at any level should have skill in listening, speaking, reading, and writing, and an understanding of the nature of language and rhetoric."[14]

Junior college teacher training would benefit enormously were all teacher training institutions to implement guidelines three and seven of the "Guidelines for Junior College English Teacher Training Programs." These read as follows:

> Successful junior college teachers should be able to:
>
> 3. understand the nature of language and be aware of the ways in which all human beings use language to order their vision of themselves and the world, to manipulate others and allow themselves to be manipulated;
>
> 7. understand the relationship among the various communication skills--reading, writing, speaking--as well as be aware of the necessary differences among them.[15]

However, teachers who wish to concentrate their attention on public persusaion might receive additional training as well. Their study of language might involve coursework in general semantics and linguistics so that they might gain a fuller understanding of the nature and function of verbal language as a man-made system. It might involve training in psychology, so that they might better understand the processes of attitude formation and motivation. It might involve training in marketing, so that they can understand the techniques employed by the advertising industry. It might involve training in media production, anthropology or the social sciences. And it might involve training in ethics, so that teachers can help their students achieve a sense of perspective in the study of an area in which the criterion of excellence is customarily effectiveness rather than accuracy.

Future teachers of public persuasion should also be trained in the many approaches which they might employ in teaching about public persuasion. A book which I have edited and which will soon be published by the National Council of Teachers of English contains over twenty essays, by teachers in several fields, describing techniques, methods, and approaches to the study of public persuasion. Entitled Teaching about Doublespeak, this book contains information on both theory and practice for instruction at the elementary, secondary, and college levels. While I cannot here summarize all the essays contained in that book, I shall attempt to summarize two of the essays which describe overall approaches to the study of persuasion.

In "The Stylistics of Belief" Julia P. Stanley describes an approach grounded in the nature of language as social contract. Her focus is the ways that "writers and speakers manipulate the English language in order to convince us that what they are saying is true and/or meaningful, or to avoid committing themselves on specific issues."[16]

This focus is concentrated on both sytax (sentence structure) and diction (word choice). Under syntax she explores what she terms "syntactic exploitation," the use of sentence structures which involve the deletion of linguistic information either "to repress information required by the reader or hearer for complete understanding of the message,"[17] or to convince the reader "that there is a message when, in fact, the utterance is meaningless."[18] Under diction she explores

sexist uses of language and uses of metaphor which reveal "the way in which (the) writer approaches and interprets the world."[19]

Stanley's linguistic approach begins by examining passive constructions and describing how the deletion of the agent in passive constructions may "obscure responsibility, insinuate the existence of a conspiracy, and shift responsibility to an unnamed 'someone.'"[20] The scope of this study of the first of the two areas of "syntactic exploitation" is then broadened to include passive adjectives, nominalized passives, experiencer predicates, and attributive adjectives. In the second area of "syntactic exploitation" Stanley examines gobbledygook and "The Lie," especially as they are employed on the political scene.

The Stanley approach is a milestone in that it brings the study of linguistics to bear on public discourse. However, it has several limitations as well. Because it is a linguistic approach, it is limited to the study of the printed and spoken word and does not encompass other visual and oral-aural symbol systems. It is not an exhaustive treatment of the linguistic elements involved in public persuasion, serving instead to highlight certain aspects of an extremely broad range of linguistic elements. And, because of the complexity of the Stanley approach, it may be difficult to employ it at the elementary and secondary levels.

The approach outlined by Hugh Rank is designed to overcome all of these limitations. It encompasses verbal, non-verbal, and mathematical languaging. It is "simple enough to be understood by very young children, and by adults not keenly interested in reading scholarly papers about

language."[21] And it encompasses the ways that "all people, in all eras, in all countries, manipulate language."[22]

The Rank approach or, more accurately, schema for teaching counter-propaganda is based on the contention that language manipulation may be viewed quite simply as "the process of intensifying or downplaying the various elements of human languages."[23] According to the Rank schema, people manipulate language: (1) to intensify their own "good"; (2) to intensify others' "bad"; (3) to downplay their own "bad"; (4) to downplay others' "good." The schema goes on to explore the ways in which people accomplish these four aims.

Intensification may be accomplished through word choice; puffery and exaggeration; verbal and non-verbal attack languaging; raising one's voice; changing one's tone, pitch, or stress; selecting dramatic type faces, capitalization, and underlining; sentence structure; the structure of larger units than sentences; and association.

According to Rank, "the underlying principle (in association) is that the persuader links (1) the idea or product being peddled, with (2) something already held favorably by or desired by, (3) the intended audience."[24] As is the case with the schema as a whole, the concept of association is presented in simple terms, but may be elaborated upon quite extensively. Among the things with which Rank sees persuaders associating themselves are: God, nature, the flag, the tribe, ideals, heroes and experts, folk-sayings, the most people, the best people, plain folks, heritage, progress, science, domestic pleasures, and sensual pleasures. Teachers and students are charged with finding these

association in public persuasion and with examining the techniques through which the associations are effected.

While the Rank approach is based on the analysis of language, Rank's definition of language is considerably broader than Stanley's. And the approach itself may be extended even beyond Rank's definition to encompass, for example, music and photography. Although the Rank schema may not be perfect, it is a considerable improvement over the seven Institute for Propaganda Analysis devices which were identified in the 1930's and are still widely taught today. According to Rank, "More than half of those textbooks which deal with propaganda analysis still rely upon the old IPA list as their basic teaching device."[25] I feel that the Rank schema represents a much more accurate, comprehensive, and practical approach to the study of public persuasion, an approach which teachers at all levels might employ to prepare their students as receivers of public persuasion.

The Rank schema might profitably be used to study the language of politics, advertising, and news reporting and politicl commentary. It might be used instead to explore forms of public languaging: the language of music, the language of color, the languages of film and photography, and the languages of written and spoken English. And it might be used to explore the ways that language can and does operate in society: the language of racism and of sexism, the language of confrontation, and the function of jargon.

Such study of language or symbol systems should be joined to a study of the media environment which employs public persuasion. Students of all ages should be acquainted with the several functions of advertising; the many forms which advertising takes; the controls placed on advertising by manufacturers and distributors, the advertising industry, and the federal, state, and local government; and some of the hidden agendas of public service, ideological, commercial, and political advertisements. The study of the language of politics should be joined with a study of American political institutions so that students might better understand not only what is being said in a given piece of political persuasion, but why it is being said, and such study should extend not only to the discourse of national political figures but to the persuasion employed in state, local, and student body political offices and contests. Students should examine the myth of objectivity in American journalism and explore the ways that traditional American media systems foster editorials and news reporting which reflect a conservative to liberal range of opinions and exclude opinions of the far right and left. Students might contrast this traditional media bias with the bias of counterculture, radical, and reactionary publications and explore the question of whether such non-traditional viewpoints should or could find expression in the mainstream of American mass media.

One exercise which secondary and college teachers might employ in the study of public persuasion would involve one student or small group

of students in an in-depth analysis of a single television commercial advertisement. The student would be asked to select a commercial, draw up a story-board layout of it, and accompany this with a 16mm film of the commercial or a tape of the commercial's sound track. The student would then be asked to explain to the rest of the class the ways in which the commercial accomplishes (or attempts to accomplish) its persuasive purpose. What psychological appeals are employed? Why did the advertiser select this music, this setting, these particular colors, the particular actors/characters employed in this commercial, the activities depicted here, etc.? Why is the visual composition as it is? What is accomplished through framing, camera angles, transitions, editing, and timing? If association techniques are employed, are they appropriate and effective? What is the effect of the commercial as a whole? What is its audience? Is the commercial ethical, tasteful, appropriate? What underlying philosophy does it express? Do you or do you not agree with this underlying philosophy? Does the commercial make any verifiable claims or is it sheer puffery? If it makes verifiable claims, are they accurate claims? Is the commercial persuasive?

Similar analytical techniques should be used to study public persuasion in the news media and in political speeches and commercials. Such study might appear in an elective course or mini-course at the secondary school level, in the college freshman English class, or in a college course devoted solely to the study of public persuasion. Its form would vary from situation to situation and the techniques used in exploring the subject would depend upon the preferences of the

individual teacher. The aim of such study would always be to extend students' understanding of the ways symbol systems are employed in modern society and to better equip students to cope with public persuasion.

In proposing "some central courses in rhetoric" for the college English or speech curriculum, Robert M. Gorrell details the form one such course might take, a course in "Rhetoric and Society." Gorrell's course would be

> . . . a broad study of some of the social implications of different rhetorical choices. It would certainly involve ethical problems in the use of language. It would not be a course in how to make friends and influence people, but it would look at some of the ways in which language is used to manipulate. I would want it to analyze uses of double-speak and circumlocution, to look at some of advertising's devices for deception, but I would not want it to be a course primarily in propaganda analysis. . . .[26]

Other teachers might employ a linguistic approach, a general semantics approach, or a media-centered approach. Perhaps the approach employed is not as important as the fact that something be done to prepare students for public persuasion. In the words of William D. Boutwell, "If the teacher can make his students aware of those forces which would mold them, would compel them to act without reasoning through the bases for their actions, would demand acceptance without question, then society, in the final summing up, would find that it owes that teacher a rather considerable debt."[27]

Notes

[1]Richard Lloyd-Jones, "The CCCC-NCTE Language Statements: New Choices for the Teacher of Writing" (Paper presented at the Conference on College Composition and Communication, 14 Mar. 1975), p. 3.

[2]Brooks and Warren, p. 181.

[3]Ibid., p. 177.

[4]J. R. Carpenter, "Voices of the Advertiser," Advertising Age, 19 Apr. 1971, p. 57.

[5]Emile G. McAnany, "Television: Mass Communication and Elite Controls," Society, Sept./Oct. 1975, p. 43.

[6]Jimmie Ellis Cook, "A Study in Critical Listening Using Eight to Ten Year Olds in an Analysis of Commercial Propaganda Emanating from Television," Dissertation Abstracts International, 33 (1973), 3147A (West Virginia University).

[7]Walker Gibson, "Seeing Ourselves," College English, 35 (1974), p. 737.

[8]Poul Anderson in an afterword to "Eutopia," in Dangerous Visions, ed. Harlan Ellison (New York: Berkley Medallion Books, 1967), p. 321.

[9]William D. Boutwell, "The Fallout," in Using Mass Media in the Schools, ed. William D. Boutwell (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1962), p. 93.

[10]Annelle Houk and Carlotta Bogart, Media Literacy: Thinking About (Dayton, Oh.: Pflaum/Standard, 1974), p. 3.

[11]Walter J. Ong, "Wired for Sound: Teaching, Communications, and Technological Culture," in Popular Media and the Teaching of English, ed. Thomas R. Giblin (Pacific Palisades, Cal.: Goodyear Publishing Company, Inc., 1972), p. 44.

[12]Michael F. Shugrue, English in a Decade of Change (New York: Pegasus, 1968), p. 175.

[13]Ibid., p. 173.

[14]National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, the National Council of Teachers of English, and the Modern Language Association of America, "Guidelines for the Preparation of Teachers of English" (Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1967), p. 8.

[15]Guidelines Committee of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, "Guidelines for Junior College English Teacher Training Programs," College Composition and Communication, 22 (1971), p. 305.

[16]Julia P. Stanley, "The Stylistics of Belief" (A revised version of a paper given at the Conference on College Composition and Communication, 6 Apr. 1974), p. 3.

[17]Ibid., pp. 3-4.

[18]Ibid., p. 4.

[19]Ibid., p. 5.

[20]Ibid., p. 6.

[21]Ibid., p. 11.

[22]Hugh Rank, "Teaching Counter-Propaganda: Rationale and a Schema" (Paper adapted from the script of a slide-show presented at the convention of the National Council of Teachers of English, 26 Nov. 1974), p. 12.

[23]Ibid.

[24]Ibid., p. 17.

[25]Ibid., p. 3.

[26]Robert M. Gorrell, "Rhetoric, Dickoric, Doc: Rhetoric as an Academic Discipline," College Composition and Communication, 26 (1975), p. 18.

[27]Boutwell, p. 12.

Bibliography

"Ad Volume in '75 Expected to be 6% above Last Year." Advertising Age, 15 Sept. 1975, pp. 3, 50, and 51.

Andersen, Kenneth A. Introduction to Communication Theory and Practice. Menlo Park, Cal.: Cummings Publishing Company, 1972.

Australian Council for Educational Research. Current Issues in the Teaching of English: Report on a Questionnaire Study: English Curricula in Australia. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service, ED 083 614, 1973.

Barrett, Edward W. "Sex, Death, and Other Trends in Magazines." Columbia Journalism Review, July/August 1974, pp. 24-26.

Bauer, Otto F. Fundamentals of Debate: Theory and Practice. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1966.

Beisecker, Thomas D., and Donn W. Parsons ed. The Process of Social Influence: Readings in Persuasion. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

Bettinghaus, Erwin P. Persuasive Communication. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968.

Boutwell, William D., ed. Using Mass Media in the Schools. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1962.

Brooks, Cleanth, and Robert Penn Warren. Modern Rhetoric. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1972.

Carpenter, J. R. "Voice of the Advertiser." Advertising Age, 19 Apr. 1971, p. 57.

Cook, Jimmie Ellis. "A Study in Critical Listening Using Eight to Ten Year Olds in an Analysis of Commercial Propaganda Emanating from Television." Dissertation Abstracts International, 33 (1973), 3146A-47A (West Virginia University).

Corley, Diana. "The Introductory Course in Speech Communication in the State of Illinois." Paper given at the annual meeting of the Illinois Speech and Theatre Association, ED 101 400, November 1974.

Crook, James Arthur. "Teaching about Mass Media in Society in the Public Schools." Dissertation Abstracts International, 34 (1973), 2324A-25A (Iowa State University).

Ellison, Harlan, ed. Dangerous Visions. New York: Berkley Medallion Books, 1967.

Giblin, Thomas R., ed. Popular Media and the Teaching of English. Pacific Palisades, Cal.: Goodyear Publishing Company, Inc., 1972.

Gibson, James W., et al. "The First Course in Speech: A Survey of U.S. Colleges and Universities." Speech Teacher, 19 (1970), pp. 13-20.

Gibson, Walker. "Seeing Ourselves." College English, 35 (1974), pp. 735-39.

Gordon, George N. Persuasion: The Theory and Practice of Manipulative Communication. New York: Hastings House, Publishers, 1971.

Gorrell, Robert M. "Rhetoric, Dickoric, Doc: Rhetoric as an Academic Discipline." College Composition and Communication, 26 (1975), pp. 14-19.

Guidelines Committee of the Conference on College Composition and Communication. "Guidelines for Junior College English Teacher Training Programs." College Composition and Communication, 22 (1971), pp. 303-313.

Houk, Annelle, and Carlotta Bogart. Media Literacy: Thinking About. Dayton, Oh.: Pflaum/Standard, 1974.

Kline, Rayna, Georgia-Mae Gallivan, and Stanley Spicer, eds. Read On, Write On. New York: Random House, Inc., 1971.

Larson, Charles U. Persuasion: Reception and Responsibility. Belmont, Cal.: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1973.

Lloyd-Jones, Richard. "The CCCC-NCTE Language Statements: New Choices for the Teacher of Writing." Paper presented at the Conference on College Composition and Communication, 14 Mar. 1975.

Macrorie, Ken. Telling Writing. New York: Hayden Book Company, Inc., 1970.

McAnany, Emile G. "Television: Mass Communication and Elite Controls." Society, Sept./Oct. 1975, pp. 41-46.

McCrimmon, James M. Writing with a Purpose. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1973.

McGinniss, Joe. The Selling of the President 1968. New York: Trident Press, 1969.

National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, the National Council of Teachers of English, and the Modern Language Association of America. "Guidelines for the Preparation of Teachers of English." Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1967.

Nimmo, Dan. The Political Persuaders: The Techniques of Modern Election Campaigns. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

Prentice, June Eleanor. "The Status of Recent Experimental, Empirical, and Rhetorical Studies in the Teaching of Persuasion." Dissertation Abstracts International, 32 (1972), 6691A (North Texas State University).

Rank, Hugh, ed. Language and Public Policy. Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1974.

Rank, Hugh. "Teaching Counter-Propaganda: Rationale and a Schema." Paper adapted from the script of a slide-show presented at the convention of the National Council of Teachers of English, 26 Nov. 1974.

Rein, Irving J. Rudy's Red Wagon: Communication Strategies in Contemporary Society. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1972.

Ruchlis, Hy. Clear Thinking. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1962.

Schorer, Mark, Philip Durham, and Everett L. Jones, eds. Harbrace College Reader. 4th ed. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1972.

Shugrue, Michael F. English in a Decade of Change. New York: Pegasus, 1968.

Smith, Ron. "Implications of the Results of a Nationwide Survey for the Teaching of Freshman English." Paper presented at the Conference on College Composition and Communication, ED 094 400, 1974.

Smith, Ron. "The Composition Requirement Today: A Report on a Nationwide Survey of Four-Year Colleges and Universities." College Composition and Communication, 25 (1974), pp. 138-48.

Stanley, Julia P. "The Stylistics of Belief." A revised version of a paper given at the Conference on College Composition and Communication, 6 Apr. 1974.

Strunk, William, Jr., and E. B. White. The Elements of Style. 2nd ed. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1972.

Tigar, Page. "ADE Survey of Freshman English." ADE Bulletin, No. 43 (November 1974), pp. 13-23.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. Statistical Abstracts of the United States. Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1974.

Wilcox, Thomas W. A Comprehensive Study of Undergraduate Programs in English in the United States. Storrs: University of Connecticut, ED 044 422, 1970.

Wyckoff, Gene. The Image Candidates: American Politics in the Age of Television. New York: Macmillan, Inc., 1968.

Appendix A

Questionnaires used in Departmental and Teacher Surveys.

Explanatory Letters which Accompanied the Questionnaires.

Dear

I am writing to enlist your support in exploring the extent to which certain aspects of rhetoric are being taught in institutions of higher education in the State of Illinois. As you know, English and speech teachers and observers of the political and cultural scene in this country have expressed increasing concern about the failure of our citizens to be aware of the ways in which they are manipulated by those who control the various media. Many think that one reason for this failure lies in the lack of attention that is paid to the persuasive uses of language by schools, colleges, and universities.

Mr. Dieterich is undertaking a survey in order to find out just how much teaching concerning the persuasive uses of language is being done by institutions of higher education in this state, which might be seen as representative of those states which have large urban, suburban, and rural populations. Junior colleges, colleges, and universities have been singled out because they tend to exert an influence on the curriculum of secondary and elementary schools, and because by examining their curricula one can determine whether the topic is one of general or specialized education. Although filling out the survey will take little time, I think that the results of the whole survey will be of use to all of us who are concerned with the teaching of English and speech at many levels and for varied purposes.

Yours very truly,

Alan C. Purves

ACP:ccl

Dear Colleague:

The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine to what degree persuasion is being taught in Illinois institutions of higher education. Although I realize that the topic of persuasion might occur in many contexts--courses in writing, literature, communications, and media, for instance--the concern of this survey is with the topic as it would occur in non-literary situations. When filling out the questionnaire, therefore, I ask that you think of the term "persuasion" with primary reference to the reception and production of persuasive language in contemporary non-literary situations (e.g., politics, advertising, news media, and the like).

Your cooperation in filling out the questionnaire as fully as possible is greatly appreciated. Each individual response will be held in the strictest confidence. Neither you nor your college will be mentioned in the published results of this survey.

You may return the quesionnaire in the enclosed self-addressed envelope. Please do so by November 15th. Thank you for your ccoperation in this survey.

Sincerely,

Daniel J. Dieterich
807 West Clark St.
Champaign, Ill. 61820

Departmental Emphasis on Persuasion

Please answer the following questions about the study of persuasion in your department as fully as possible. The concern of this study is persuasion as it occurs in non-literary situations. When filling out this questionnaire please think of the term "persuasion" with primary reference to the reception and production of persuasive language in contemporary non-literary situations (e.g., politics, advertising, news media, and the like).

(Please circle one answer number for each question unless otherwise instructed.)

1. Does your department offer a course devoted entirely or primarily to the study of persuasion?
   Yes. 1
   No. 2

2. Is a unit on persuasion contained in one or more of your courses?
   Yes. 1
   No. . . . . 2 (See question 3)

3. If not, is the addition of such study being contemplated?
   Yes. . . . . 1 (See questions 4 and 5)
   No. . . . . 2 (See question 5)

4. If so, for what course? _____

5. Why is the study of persuasion presently omitted from your curriculum? (Circle the answer number or numbers of those that apply.)
   The subject is relatively unimportant, given other department priorities. 1
   The staff is not adequately prepared to teach this subject. 2
   The subject is not one which commands students' interest. 3
   Other (please specify): _____

_____

_____

(Note: If you answered "NO" to questions 1 and 2, and have filled in those sections which apply to your curriculum, you may now stop. Thank you for your help on this survey. Please use the enclosed envelope to return your questionnaire.)

6. If your department does offer a course on persuasion, list the title(s) of the course(s) _____

_____

_____

7. Is any course in persuasion required by your department?

Yes. 1

(please specify course) _____

(for whom required) _____

No. 2

8. What is the length of the course(s) in persuasion?

(please specify course) _____

Duration: one quarter . . . . . 1; one semester 2

other (please specify) _____

9. If a unit on persuasion is contained in one or more courses, what is (are) the title(s) of the course(s)? (If not, skip to question 12.)

_____

_____

_____

10. Is (Are) the course(s) in which it is contained (a) required course(s)?

Yes, all required. 1

Yes, some required. 2

(please specify courses) _____

No, none required. 3

11. What length of time is devoted to the study of persuasion?

(please specify course) _____

One month. . . . 1; Two weeks. . . . 2; One week. . . . 3;

Other (please specify) _____

(please specify course) _____

One month. . . . 1; Two weeks. . . . 2; One week. . . . 3;

Other (please specify) _____

12. Is a textbook or other commercial material used in the study of persuasion?
Yes. . . . . 1 (See question 13)
No. . . . . 2 (See question 14)

13. If so, which one(s):

(Course or unit) _____ (Title) _____

(Publisher) _____

(Course or unit) _____ (Title) _____

(Publisher) _____

(Course or unit) _____ (Title) _____

(Publisher) _____

14. Please list the names of those teachers in your department presently teaching a course on persuasion or a course containing a unit on persuasion.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

15. Please enclose a copy of your course outlines or syllabi for courses which deal with persuasion or which include units dealing with persuasion.

Thank you for your cooperation in filling out this questionnaire. Please check the box to the right if you would like to receive a copy of the results of this survey. You may use the enclosed prepaid envelope to return the questionnaire.

☐

February 1, 1975

Dear Colleague:

This is my second letter to you concerning the survey I am conducting on the extent to which certain aspects of persuasion are taught in Illinois institutions of higher education. I am writing again in order to enlist your support in this important project. Please take a few minutes to fill out the questionnaire enclosed with this letter and return it in the stamped, self-addressed envelope.

The concern of this survey is with persuasion as it occurs in non-literary situations, especially the reception and production of persuasive language in contemporary politics, advertising, news media, and the like, Your cooperation in filling out the questionnaire and returning it by February 15, 1975 would be greatly appreciated. Each individual response will be held in the strictest confidence. Neither you nor your college will be mentioned in the published results of the survey.

Because of the small number of responses when I last distributed the enclosed questionnaire, the reliability of my survey was very low. I can easily understand the many demands made upon your time. However, I think that this survey will be of use to everyone concerned with the teaching of English. I hope that you will be able to contribute to making it a success. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Daniel J. Dieterich
807 West Clark Street
Champaign, Illinios 61820

Questionnaire enclosed

Dear Colleague:

I am writing to ask your help in a survey on the teaching of persuasion in the State of Illinois. I have already completed a survey of those chairing departments of communication, English, and speech in Illinois institutions of higher education, a survey which revealed the extent to which persuasion is now being taught in Illinois. To complete my survey, I am writing to those teaching about persuasion in order to discover how persuasion is being taught, what aspects of persuasion are being emphasized.

The concern of this survey is with the topic of persuasion as it occurs in non-literary situations, the reception and production of persuasive messages in politics, advertising, news media, and the like. Your cooperation in filling out the questionnaire as fully as possible is greatly appreciated. Each individual response will be held in the strictest confidence. Neither you nor your college will be mentioned in the published results of this survey.

You may return the questionnaire in the enclosed self-addressed envelope. Please do so by April 15th. I hope that, with your cooperation, this survey will be of use to everyone concerned with the teaching of persuasion. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Daniel J. Dieterich
807 West Clark Street
Champaign, Illinois 61820

Enclosed: Questionnaire

The Teaching of Persuasion

The concern of this study is persuasion as it occurs in non-literary situations. When filling out this questionnaire please think of the term "persuasion" with primary reference to the reception and production of persuasive messages in contemporary non-literary situations (e.g., politics, advertising, news media, and the like).

Name:_____ College:_____

Years of Teaching Experience:_____ Highest Degree Attained:

B.A.____; M.A.____; Advanced Certificate____; Ph.D.____; Ed.D.____;

Other_____

Area of specialization for last degree:_____

****

1. What are your goals or main emphases in your teaching of persuasion?

_____

_____

_____

2. What length of time do you devote to the study of persuasion?

One Semester____; One Quarter____; One Month____; One Week____;

Other (specify)_____

3. In teaching, do you seek to prepare students as persuaders, persuadees, or both?

Persuaders_____; Persuadees_____; Both_____ (See 3A)

3A. If both, is preparation for one of the two roles emphasized?

Yes, the role of persuader____; Yes, the role of persuadee_____;

No, both emphasized equally_____

4. How much emphasis is devoted to the following aspects of persuasion?

Advertising Persuasion...Little or none___; Minor___; Major___

Argumentation.....Little or none___; Minor___; Major___

Denotation/Connotation...Little or none___; Minor___; Major___

Ethics of Persuasion.....Little or none___; Minor___; Major___

Euphemisms.....Little or none___; Minor___; Major___

Logic.....Little or none___; Minor___; Major___

Logical Fallacies.....Little or none___; Minor___; Major___

Nonverbal Persuasion.....Little or none___; Minor___; Major___

Political Persuasion.....Little or none___; Minor___; Major___

Propaganda Techniques....Little or none___; Minor___; Major___

Persuasion in the Mass Media (exclusive of advertising)

A. Print Media.....Little or none___; Minor___; Major___

B. Nonprint Media.....Little or none___; Minor___; Major___

Other (Please specify)_____

Little or none___; Minor___; Major___

5. As part of their study of persuasion, are students asked to:

A. Write persuasive materials geared toward an audience larger than the class itself (e.g., letters to the editor or to political candidates)?

Yes_____; No_____

B. Write persuasive materials geared toward other members of the class?

Yes_____; No_____

C. Construct and present persuasive oral presentations?

Yes_____; No_____

D. Demonstrate non-verbal techniques for the purpose of persuasion?

Yes_____; No_____

6. What commercial texts are required for your course or unit on persuasion?

_____

_____

_____

7. How frequently do you use the following supplementary materials in the study of persuasion?

Newspaper or Magazine Editorials.....Seldom or never___;

Occasionally___; Frequently___

Newspaper or Magazine Ads.....Seldom or never___;

Occasionally___; Frequently___

Taped or Printed Transcripts of
Political Speeches.....Seldom or never___;

Occasionally___; Frequently___

Televised Ads.....Seldom or never___;

Occasionally___; Frequently___

Radio Ads.....Seldom or never___;

Occasionally___; Frequently___

Televised News Commentaries.....Seldom or never___;

Occasionally___; Frequently___

Rado News Commentaries.....Seldom or never___;

Occasionally___; Frequently___

Other (please specify):_____

_____

_____....Seldom or never___; Occasionally

____; Frequently_____

8. Which of the following terms best describes your overall approach to the study of persuasion?

Rhetorical____; General Semantics____; Linguistic____; Other (please specify):_____

9. Please enclose a copy of your course outlines or syllabi describing courses or units dealing with persuasion.

****

Thank you for your cooperation in filling out this questionnaire. Please check the circle to the right if you would like to receive a copy of the results of this survey. You may make use of the enclosed prepaid envelope to return this questionnaire to me. ○

APPENDIX B

Results of the Departmental Survey in Table Form.

Departmental Survey

Table 1

Question 1

Does your department offer a course devoted entirely or primarily to the study of persuasion? Yes. 1
No. 2

	Yes		No		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Total Responses	44	33%	88	67%	132	100%
Two year institutions	14	23%	47	77%	61	100%
Four year institutions	30	42%	41	58%	71	100%
Private institutions	21	37%	37	63%	58	100%
Public institutions	23	31%	51	69%	74	100%
Large institutions	28	36%	49	64%	77	100%
Small institutions	16	29%	39	71%	55	100%
English departments	15	21%	58	79%	73	100%
Speech departments	29	49%	30	51%	59	100%

Departmental Survey

Table 2

Question 2

Is a unit on persuasion contained in one or more of your courses? Yes. 1
No. . . . . 2 (See question 3)

	Yes		No		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Total Responses	103	82%	23	18%	126	100%
Two year institutions	52	87%	8	13%	60	100%
Four year institutions	51	77%	15	23%	66	100%
Private institutions	39	74%	14	26%	53	100%
Public institutions	64	88%	9	12%	73	100%
Large institutions	65	88%	9	12%	74	100%
Small institutions	38	73%	14	27%	52	100%
English departments	57	80%	14	20%	71	100%
Speech departments	46	84%	9	16%	55	100%

Departmental Survey

Table 3

Question 3

If not, is the addition of such study being contemplated?
Yes. . . . . 1 (See questions 4 and 5)
No. . . . . 2 (See question 5)

	Yes		No		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Total Responses	4	18%	18	82%	22	100%
Two year institutions	1	9%	10	91%	11	100%
Four year institutions	3	27%	8	73%	11	100%
Private institutions	3	25%	9	75%	12	100%
Public institutions	1	10%	9	90%	10	100%
Large institutions	2	18%	9	82%	11	100%
Small institutions	2	18%	9	82%	11	100%
English departments	3	21%	11	79%	14	100%
Speech departments	1	13%	7	88%	8	101%

Departmental Survey

Table 4

Question 5 Why is the study of persuasion omitted from your curriculum? (Circle the answer number or numbers of those that apply.)

The subject is relatively unimportant, given other department priorities. 1
The staff is not adequately prepared to teach this subject 2
The subject is not one which commands students' interest . 3
Other (please specify): _____

	1		2		3		1 + 3		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Total Responses	5	63%	1	13%	1	13%	1	13%	8	102%
Two year institutions	2		0		1		0		3	
Four year institutions	3		1		0		1		5	
Private institutions	3		1		1		1		6	
Public institutions	2		0		0		0		2	
Large institutions	1		0		1		0		2	
Small institutions	4		1		0		1		6	
English departments	5		1		0		0		6	
Speech departments	0		0		1		1		2	

Departmental Survey

Table 5 — If your department does offer a course on persuasion, list the title(s) of the course(s)_____

Question 6

Course titles:	Number of courses:	Percentage of total:
Persuasion	36	58%
Argumentation & Debate	9	15%
Advanced Composition	4	6%
Mass Media/Mass Communication	3	5%
Propaganda	2	3%
Logic	2	3%
Writers' Workshop	1	2%
Communication Theory	1	2%
Rhetorical Theory	1	2%
Extemporaneous Public Speaking	1	2%
Copy and Advertising Writing	1	2%
Language of Protest	1	2%
	62 Total	102%

Departmental Survey

Table 6

Question 7 Is any course in persuasion required by your department?

Yes. 1

(please specify course) _____

(for whom required) _____

No. 2

	Yes		No		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Total Responses	14	33%	28	67%	42	100%
Two year institutions	2	14%	12	86%	14	100%
Four year institutions	12	43%	16	57%	28	100%
Private institutions	8	42%	11	58%	19	100%
Public institutions	6	26%	17	74%	23	100%
Large institutions	10	37%	17	63%	27	100%
Small institutions	4	27%	11	73%	15	100%
English departments	4	29%	10	71%	14	100%
Speech departments	10	36%	18	64%	28	100%

	n	%
Total courses required	14	100%
Courses required for speech majors only	11	79%
Courses required for secondary education majors only	1	7%
Courses required for broadcasting majors only	1	7%

Departmental Survey

Table 7

Question 8

What is the length of the course(s) in persuasion?

(please specify course) _____
Duration: one quarter . . . 1; one semester . . . 2

other (please specify) _____

	quarter		semester or trimester		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Total Responses	11	26%	31	74%	42	100%
Two year institutions	5	36%	9	64%	14	100%
Four year institutions	6	21%	22	79%	28	100%
Private institutions	4	21%	15	79%	19	100%
Public institutions	7	30%	16	70%	23	100%
Large institutions	7	26%	20	74%	27	100%
Small institutions	4	27%	11	73%	15	100%
English departments	4	29%	10	71%	14	100%
Speech departments	7	25%	21	75%	28	100%

Departmental Survey

Table 8

Question 9 — If a unit on persuasion is contained in one or more courses, what is (are) the title(s) of the course(s)? (If not, skip to question 12.)

Course titles:	Number of courses:	Percentage of total:
Introductory English (includes rhetoric & comp.)	58	36%
Foundations of Communication	37	23%
Effective Speaking	15	9%
Mass Communication	7	4%
Advanced Composition	6	4%
Argumentation	4	2%
Verbal Communication	4	2%
Group Discussion	4	2%
Advanced Oral Communication	3	1%
Business and Professional Speech	3	1%
Techniques of Prose Writing	3	1%
Informative Writing	2	1%
Introductory Speech	1	1%
Adolescent Literature	1	1%
Man and His Communication	1	1%
Nonprint Media and the Teaching of English	1	1%
Man and His Language	1	1%
Political Communication	1	1%
Critical Thinking	1	1%
Interpretation	1	1%

Departmental Survey

Table 8

Question 9 (continued)

Modes of Humanistic Thought	1	1%
Oral Reporting	1	1%
Rhetorical Theory	1	1%
Introduction to Journalism	1	1%
Interpersonal Communication	1	1%
Technical Report Writing	1	1%
Technical Communication	1	1%
Developmental Reading	1	1%
	162 Total	102%

Departmental Survey

Table 9

Question 10 Is (Are) the course(s) in which it is contained (a) required course(s)?

Yes, all required 1
Yes, some required 2

(please specify courses) _____

No, none required 3

	Yes		No		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Total Responses	79	84%	15	16%	94	100%
Two year institutions	40	87%	6	13%	46	100%
Four year institutions	39	81%	9	19%	48	100%
Private institutions	25	74%	9	26%	34	100%
Public institutions	54	90%	6	10%	60	100%
Large institutions	53	85%	9	15%	62	100%
Small institutions	26	81%	6	19%	32	100%
English departments	45	88%	6	12%	51	100%
Speech departments	34	79%	9	21%	43	100%

Departmental Survey

Table 10

Question 11

What length of time is devoted to the study of persuasion?
(please specify course) _____
One month. . . 1; Two weeks. . . 2; One week. . . 3;
Other (please specify) _____

	Two weeks or less		Between 2 weeks and one month		More than a month		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Total Responses	48	46%	45	43%	11	11%	104	100%
Two year institutions	25	42%	26	44%	8	14%	59	100%
Four year institutions	23	51%	19	42%	3	7%	45	100%
Private institutions	17	47%	16	44%	3	8%	36	99%
Public institutions	31	46%	29	43%	8	12%	68	101%
Large institutions	26	39%	31	47%	9	14%	66	100%
Small institutions	22	58%	14	37%	2	5%	38	100%
English departments	32	56%	23	40%	2	4%	57	100%
Speech departments	16	34%	22	47%	9	19%	47	100%

Departmental Survey

Table 11

Question 12

Is a textbook or other commercial material used in the study of persuasion?

Yes. . . . . 1 (See question 13)
No. . . . . 2 (See question 14)

	Yes		No		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Total Responses	77	76%	24	24%	101	100%
Two year institutions	38	79%	10	21%	48	100%
Four year institutions	39	74%	14	26%	53	100%
Private institutions	30	73%	11	27%	41	100%
Public institutions	47	78%	13	22%	60	100%
Large institutions	48	80%	12	20%	60	100%
Small institutions	29	71%	12	29%	41	100%
English departments	38	70%	16	30%	54	100%
Speech departments	39	83%	8	17%	47	100%

Departmental Survey

Table 12

If so, which one(s):

Question 13

English:

Writing with a Purpose - 11
The Practical Sylist - 2
Patterns of Exposition - 2
Rhetoric Made Plain - 1
Identity through Prose - 1
Language in Thought and Action - 1
Prentice-Hall Handbook - 1
Rhetorical Considerations - 1
Coming to Terms with Language - 1
American Rhetoric - 1
The Complete Stylist - 1
Rhetoric: Principles and Usage - 1
Words and Ideas - 1
Contexts for Composition - 1
Classical Rhetoric - 1
Twenty Questions - 1
Writing from Example - 1
From Thought to Theme - 1
Questions of Rhetoric and Usage - 1
Prose Style - 1
Logic and Contemporary Rhetoric - 1
Improving Your Reasoning - 1
Read On, Write On - 1
Writers' Guide - 1
Preface to Critical Reading - 1
Perception and Persuasion - 1
Modes of Argument - 1
Popular Writing in America - 1

Total: 108 texts
Speech texts: 67
English texts: 41

Different texts: 77
Different speech texts: 48
Different English texts: 29

Speech:

Principles and Types of Speech Communication - 5
Speech Communication - 3
The Challenge of Effective Speaking - 3
Persuasion: Theory and Practice - 3
On Speech Communication -2
Rudy's Red Wagon - 2
Influencing Attitudes & Changing Behavior - 2
The Message, The Audience, The Speaker - 2
Approaching Speech Communication - 2
Introduction to Communication Theory and Practice - 2
Oral Communication - 2
Speaking Is a Practical Matter - 2
Let's Talk - 2
Human Communication - 1
Readings in Persuasion - 1
Effective Speech - 1
The Process of Social Influence - 1
Techniques of Persuasion - 1
Speech and Behavioral Change - 1
Persuasive Communication - 1
Persuasion - 1
Argument: An Alternative to Violence - 1
Basic Oral Communication - 1
Perspectives on Persuasion - 1
The Art of Persuasion - 1
Persuasive Speech - 1
Introduction to Rhetorical Communication - 1
Modes of Argument - 1
Designs for Persuasive Communication - 1
Persuasive Speaking - 1
The Psychology of Persuasion - 1
Communicative Speaking and Listening - 1
Discussion and Group Methods - 1
Elements of Deliberative Debating - 1

Departmental Survey

Table 12

Question 13 (continued)

Speech:

Strategic Debate - 1
Mass Media: The Invisible Environment - 1
Mass Media in a Free Society - 1
Persuasive Speaking - 1
Persuasion - 1
How Opinions and Attitudes Are Changed - 1
Persuasion: Reception and Responsibility - 1
A Synoptic History of Classical Rhetoric - 1
Readings in Classical Rhetoric - 1
The Rhetoric of Blair, Campbell, & Whately - 1
Argument and Debate - 1
Thinking and Speaking - 1
Human Communication - 1
Speech: An Interpersonal Approach - 1

Appendix C

Results of the Teacher Survey in Table Form.

Teaching Survey

Table 1

Teaching Experience

Years of Teaching Experience: _____

Years of Teaching Experience

	1 - 5	6 - 10	11 - 15	16 - 20	21 - 25	26 + over	Total
Number of Teachers	20 21%	32 33%	16 17%	12 13%	9 9%	7 7%	99 100%

Teaching Survey

Table 2

Highest Degree Attained

Highest Degree Attained: B.A.____; M.A.____; Advanced Certificate____; Ph.D.____; Ed.D.____; Other_____

	Advanced Certificate		M.A.		Ph.D.		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Total Responses	5	5%	60	60%	35	35%	100	100%
Two year institutions	5	9%	43	80%	6	11%	54	100%
Four year institutions	0	0%	17	37%	29	63%	46	100%
Private institutions	0	0%	14	44%	18	56%	32	100%
Public institutions	5	7%	46	68%	17	25%	68	100%
Large institutions	4	6%	36	58%	22	35%	62	99%
Small institutions	1	3%	24	63%	13	34%	38	100%
English departments	2	3%	38	61%	22	35%	62	99%
Speech departments	3	8%	22	58%	13	34%	38	100%

Teaching Survey

Table 3

Area of Specialization

Area of specialization for last degree: _____

Teachers in English Departments

Number	Area
15	English Literature or English Literary Periods
13	English
11	American Literature or American Literary Periods
5	Education or English Education
2	Education Administration
2	Philosophy
1	Modern Drama
1	Persuasion
1	Journalism
1	Reading
1	Science and Literature
1	Religion and Literature
1	German Literature
55	Total number of English teachers responding

Teachers in Speech Departments

Number	Area
8	Speech
5	Speech Communication or Communication
5	Theatre or Dramatics
4	Speech Education
3	Public Address
2	Group Communication
2	Communication Theory
2	Rhetoric
1	Interpretation
1	Mass Communication
1	Intercultural Persuasion
34	Total number of speech teachers responding

89 Total number of responses

Teaching Survey

Table 4

Question #1

What are your goals or main emphases in your teaching of persuasion?

Number	Categories of Emphases
10	Ethics
7	Writing Skills
22	Logic
7	Psychological and Emotional Appeals
4	Motivation
2	Propaganda
37	Critical Reception of Persuasion
40	The Construction of Persuasive Messages
6	The Critical Reception of Argument
8	The Construction of Effective Arguments
4	Media Reception
147	Total number of emphases mentioned in responses

Teaching Survey

Table 5

Question #2 What length of time do you devote to the study of persuasion?

One Semester___; One Quarter___; One Month___; One Week___;

Other (specify)_____

	2 Weeks or Less		Between 2 Weeks & 1 Mo.		More Than One Month		One Sem. or Quarter		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Total Responses	20	21%	30	31%	8	8%	39	40%	97	100%
Two year institutions	11	20%	22	41%	4	7%	17	32%	54	100%
Four year institutions	9	21%	8	19%	4	9%	22	51%	43	100%
Private institutions	6	21%	6	21%	2	7%	14	50%	28	99%
Public institutions	14	20%	24	35%	6	9%	25	36%	69	100%
Large institutions	10	16%	19	30%	6	10%	28	44%	63	100%
Small institutions	10	29%	11	32%	2	6%	11	32%	34	99%
English departments	16	26%	21	34%	5	8%	20	32%	62	100%
Speech departments	4	11%	9	26%	3	9%	19	54%	35	100%

Teaching Survey

Table 6

Question #3

In teaching, do you seek to prepare students as persuaders, persuadees, or both?

Persuaders ____; Persuadees ____; Both ____ (See 3A)

	Persuaders		Persuadees		Both		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Total Responses	13	13%	4	4%	85	83%	102	100%
Two year institutions	6	11%	1	2%	49	88%	56	101%
Four year institutions	7	15%	3	7%	36	78%	46	100%
Private institutions	3	10%	1	3%	26	87%	30	100%
Public institutions	10	14%	3	4%	59	82%	72	100%
Large institutions	8	13%	3	5%	53	83%	64	101%
Small institutions	5	13%	1	3%	32	84%	38	100%
English departments	10	16%	3	5%	51	80%	64	101%
Speech departments	3	8%	1	3%	34	89%	38	100%

Teaching Survey

Table 7

Question #3A

If both, is preparation for one of the two roles emphasized?

Yes, the role of persuader___; Yes, the role of persuadee___;

No, both emphasized equally___

	Persuader		Persuadee		Both Roles		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Total Responses	36	43%	13	15%	35	42%	84	100%
Two year institutions	19	40%	8	17%	21	44%	48	101%
Four year institutions	17	47%	5	14%	14	39%	36	100%
Private institutions	9	36%	5	20%	11	44%	25	100%
Public institutions	27	46%	8	14%	24	41%	59	101%
Large institutions	30	56%	6	11%	18	33%	54	100%
Small institutions	6	20%	7	23%	17	57%	30	100%
English departments	20	41%	9	18%	20	41%	49	100%
Speech departments	16	46%	4	11%	15	43%	35	100%

Teaching Survey

Table 8

Question #4A

How much emphasis is devoted to the following aspects of persuasion?

Advertising Persuasion. . .Little or none___; Minor___; Major___

	Little or none		Minor		Major		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Total Responses	20	20%	43	43%	37	37%	100	100%
Two year institutions	10	18%	23	42%	22	40%	55	100%
Four year institutions	10	22%	20	44%	15	33%	45	99%
Private institutions	5	17%	16	55%	8	28%	29	100%
Public institutions	15	21%	27	38%	29	41%	71	100%
Large institutions	14	22%	22	35%	27	43%	63	100%
Small institutions	6	16%	21	57%	10	27%	37	100%
English departments	12	19%	34	54%	17	27%	63	100%
Speech departments	8	22%	9	24%	20	54%	37	100%

Teaching Survey

Table 9

Question #4B

Argumentation.....Little or none___; Minor___; Major___

	Little or None		Minor		Major		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Total Responses	15	15%	16	16%	70	69%	101	100%
Two year institutions	5	9%	5	9%	45	82%	55	100%
Four year institutions	10	22%	11	24%	25	54%	46	100%
Private institutions	5	17%	5	17%	20	67%	30	101%
Public institutions	10	14%	11	15%	50	70%	71	99%
Large institutions	11	17%	11	17%	42	66%	64	100%
Small institutions	4	11%	5	14%	28	76%	37	101%
English departments	4	6%	8	13%	51	81%	64	100%
Speech departments	11	29%	8	21%	19	50%	38	100%

Teaching Survey

Table 10

Question #4C

Denotation/Connotation...Little or none___; Minor___; Major___

	Little or None		Minor		Major		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Total Responses	11	11%	56	56%	33	33%	100	100%
Two year institutions	7	13%	28	51%	20	36%	55	100%
Four yeár institutions	4	9%	28	62%	13	29%	45	100%
Private institutions	1	3%	19	66%	9	31%	29	100%
Public institutions	10	14%	37	52%	24	34%	71	100%
Large institutions	8	13%	37	58%	19	30%	64	101%
Small institutions	3	8%	19	53%	14	39%	36	100%
English departments	4	6%	35	56%	23	37%	62	99%
Speech departments	7	18%	21	55%	10	26%	38	99%

Teaching Survey

Table 11

Question #4D

Ethics of Persuasion....Little or none___; Minor___; Major___

	Little or None		Minor		Major		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Total Responses	15	15%	44	44%	42	42%	101	101%
Two year institutions	10	18%	26	47%	19	35%	55	100%
Four year institutions	5	11%	18	39%	23	50%	46	100%
Private institutions	4	13%	13	43%	13	43%	30	99%
Public institutions	11	15%	31	44%	29	41%	71	100%
Large institutions	8	13%	29	45%	27	42%	64	100%
Small institutions	7	19%	15	41%	15	41%	37	101%
English departments	12	19%	25	40%	26	41%	63	100%
Speech departments	3	8%	19	50%	16	42%	38	100%

Teaching Survey

Table 12

Question #4E

Euphemisms.....Little or none___; Minor___; Major___

	Little or None		Minor		Major		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Total Responses	49	49%	43	43%	9	9%	101	101%
Two year institutions	26	47%	25	45%	4	7%	55	99%
Four year institutions	23	50%	18	39%	5	11%	46	100%
Private institutions	16	53%	14	47%	0	0%	30	100%
Public institutions	33	46%	29	41%	9	13%	71	100%
Large institutions	30	47%	27	42%	7	11%	64	100%
Small institutions	19	51%	16	43%	2	5%	37	99%
English departments	26	41%	28	44%	9	14%	63	99%
Speech departments	23	61%	15	39%	0	0%	38	100%

Teaching Survey

Table 13

Question #4F

Logic.....Little or none___; Minor___; Major___

	Little or None		Minor		Major		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Total Responses	9	9%	30	30%	61	61%	100	100%
Two year institutions	3	5%	15	27%	37	67%	55	99%
Four year institutions	6	13%	15	33%	24	53%	45	99%
Private institutions	3	10%	8	28%	18	62%	29	100%
Public institutions	6	8%	22	31%	43	61%	71	100%
Large institutions	7	11%	17	27%	40	63%	64	101%
Small institutions	2	6%	13	36%	21	58%	36	100%
English departments	3	5%	15	24%	44	71%	62	100%
Speech departments	6	16%	15	39%	17	45%	38	100%

Teaching Survey

Table 14

Question #4G

Logical Fallacies.....Little or none___; Minor___; Major___

	Little or None		Minor		Major		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Total Responses	12	12%	31	31%	57	57%	100	100%
Two year institutions	2	4%	17	31%	36	65%	55	100%
Four year institutions	10	22%	14	31%	21	47%	45	100%
Private institutions	6	21%	9	31%	14	48%	29	100%
Public institutions	6	8%	22	31%	43	61%	71	100%
Large institutions	7	11%	19	30%	38	59%	64	100%
Small institutions	5	14%	12	33%	19	53%	36	100%
English departments	6	10%	15	24%	41	66%	62	100%
Speech departments	6	16%	16	42%	16	42%	38	100%

Teaching Survey

Table 15

Question #4H

Nonverbal Persuasion....Little or none___; Minor___; Major___

	Little or None		Minor		Major		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Total Responses	38	38%	42	42%	20	20%	100	100%
Two year institutions	24	44%	22	40%	9	16%	55	100%
Four yeár institutions	14	31%	20	44%	11	24%	45	99%
Private institutions	10	33%	13	43%	7	23%	30	99%
Public institutions	28	40%	29	41%	13	19%	70	100%
Large institutions	25	40%	26	41%	12	19%	63	100%
Small institutions	13	35%	16	43%	8	22%	37	100%
English departments	30	48%	25	40%	7	11%	82	99%
Speech departments	8	21%	17	45%	13	34%	38	100%

Teaching Survey

Table 16

Question #4I

Political Persuasion.....Little or none___; Minor___; Major___

	Little or None		Minor		Major		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Total Responses	23	23%	49	49%	27	27%	99	99%
Two year institutions	12	22%	32	58%	11	20%	55	100%
Four year institutions	11	25%	17	39%	16	36%	44	100%
Private institutions	9	32%	8	29%	11	39%	28	100%
Public institutions	14	20%	41	58%	16	23%	71	101%
Large institutions	13	21%	30	48%	20	32%	63	101%
Small institutions	10	28%	19	53%	7	19%	36	100%
English departments	15	24%	34	54%	14	22%	63	100%
Speech departments	8	22%	15	42%	13	36%	36	100%

Teaching Survey

Table 17

Question #4J

Propaganda Techniques...Little or none___; Minor___; Major___

	Little or None		Minor		Major		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Total Responses	20	20%	44	44%	36	36%	100	100%
Two year institutions	7	13%	26	47%	22	40%	55	100%
Four year institutions	13	29%	18	40%	14	31%	45	100%
Private institutions	9	30%	13	43%	8	27%	30	100%
Public institutions	11	16%	31	44%	28	40%	70	100%
Large institutions	11	17%	28	44%	24	38%	63	99%
Small institutions	9	24%	16	43%	12	32%	37	99%
English departments	14	23%	29	47%	19	31%	62	101%
Speech departments	6	16%	15	39%	17	45%	38	100%

Teaching Survey

Table 18

Question #4K

Persuasion in the Mass Media (exclusive of advertising)

A. Print Media.....Little or none___; Minor___; Major___

	Little or None		Minor		Major		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Total Responses	25	25%	46	46%	29	29%	100	100%
Two year institutions	14	25%	26	47%	15	27%	55	99%
Four year institutions	11	24%	20	44%	14	31%	45	99%
Private institutions	6	20%	15	50%	9	30%	30	100%
Public institutions	19	27%	31	44%	20	29%	70	100%
Large institutions	19	30%	27	43%	17	27%	63	100%
Small institutions	6	16%	19	51%	12	32%	37	99%
English departments	16	26%	24	39%	22	35%	62	100%
Speech departments	9	24%	22	58%	7	18%	38	100%

Teaching Survey

Table 19

Question #4L

B. Nonprint Media. . . .Little or none___; Minor___; Major___

	Little or None		Minor		Major		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Total Responses	37	38%	33	34%	27	28%	97	100%
Two year institutions	20	37%	20	37%	14	26%	54	100%
Four year institutions	17	40%	13	30%	13	30%	43	100%
Private institutions	12	41%	11	38%	6	21%	29	100%
Public institutions	25	37%	22	32%	21	31%	68	100%
Large institutions	25	41%	17	28%	19	31%	61	100%
Small institutions	12	33%	16	44%	8	22%	36	99%
English departments	27	45%	22	37%	11	18%	60	100%
Speech departments	10	27%	11	30%	16	43%	37	100%

Teaching Survey

Table 20

Question #5A

As part of their study of persuasion, are students asked to:

A. Write persuasive materials geared toward an audience larger than the class itself (e.g., letters to the editor or to political candidates)?

Yes_____; No_____

	Yes		No		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Total Responses	52	52%	48	48%	100	100%
Two year institutions	27	49%	28	51%	55	100%
Four year institutions	25	56%	20	44%	45	100%
Private institutions	15	50%	15	50%	30	100%
Public institutions	37	53%	33	47%	70	100%
Large institutions	30	48%	33	52%	63	100%
Small institutions	22	59%	15	41%	37	100%
English departments	40	65%	22	35%	62	100%
Speech departments	12	32%	26	68%	38	100%

Teaching Survey

Table 21

Question #5B

B. Write persuasive materials geared toward other members of the class?

Yes_____; No_____

	Yes		No		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Total Responses	65	65%	35	35%	100	100%
Two year institutions	39	71%	16	29%	55	100%
Four year institutions	26	58%	19	42%	45	100%
Private institutions	21	70%	9	30%	30	100%
Public institutions	44	63%	26	37%	70	100%
Large institutions	36	67%	18	34%	54	101%
Small institutions	29	63%	17	37%	46	100%
English departments	39	63%	23	37%	62	100%
Speech departments	26	68%	12	32%	38	100%

Teaching Survey

Table 22

Question #5C

C. Construct and present persuasive oral presentations?

Yes_____; No_____

	Yes		No		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Total Responses	51	52%	48	48%	99	100%
Two year institutions	31	57%	23	43%	54	100%
Four year institutions	20	44%	25	56%	45	100%
Private institutions	14	47%	16	53%	30	100%
Public institutions	37	54%	32	46%	69	100%
Large institutions	34	54%	29	46%	63	100%
Small institutions	17	46%	19	54%	36	100%
English departments	17	28%	44	72%	61	100%
Speech departments	34	89%	4	11%	38	100%

Teaching Survey

Table 23

Question #5D

D. Demonstrate non-verbal techniques for the purpose of persuasion?

Yes_____; No_____

	Yes		No		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Total Responses	30	31%	68	69%	98	100%
Two year institutions	16	30%	38	70%	54	100%
Four year institutions	14	32%	30	68%	44	100%
Private institutions	8	27%	22	73%	30	100%
Public institutions	22	32%	46	68%	68	100%
Large institutions	21	34%	41	66%	62	100%
Small institutions	9	25%	27	75%	36	100%
English departments	11	18%	49	82%	60	100%
Speech departments	19	50%	19	50%	38	100%

Teaching Survey

Table 24

Question #6 What commercial texts are required for your course or unit on persuasion?

_____

_____

_____

Teachers of Speech

Number	Title
4	Persuasive Communication
4	Principles of Speech Communication
2	Contemporary American Speeches
2	The Art of Persuasion
2	Persuasion: Perception & Response
2	Persuasion: Speech & Behavioral Change
2	Persuasion: Theory & Practice
2	The Psychology of Persuasive Speaking
2	Rudy's Red Wagon
2	Introduction to Communication Theory & Practice
2	Speech Communication
1	Human Communication
1	Let's Talk
1	A Guide to Public Speaking
1	Argumentation & Debate
1	Thinking & Speaking
1	On Speech Communication
1	Persuasive Speaking
1	Designs for Persuasive Communication
1	Fundamentals of Debate
1	Beliefs, Attitudes & Human Affairs
1	The Message, The Speaker, The Audience
1	New Techniques of Persuasion
1	The Process of Social Influence
1	Dynamics of Human Communication
1	Attitude Change
1	Theories of Social Influence
1	Basic Oral Communication
1	Introduction to Mass Communication
1	Principles of News Reporting
1	Influencing Attitudes and Changing Behaviors
1	Television and Society
1	Due to Circumstances beyond Our Control

48 citations of 33 books

Teaching Survey

Table 24 (continued)

Teachers of English

Number	Title
10	Writing with a Purpose
2	The Complete Stylist
2	Modes of Argument
2	Writer's Guide & Index to English
1	Violence: Causes & Solutions
1	Understanding Media
1	Modern Rhetoric
1	Animal Farm
1	Brave New World Revisited
1	Juxtaposition & Juxtaposition Encore
1	The Writer's Voice
1	Read On Write On
1	The Popular Arts in America
1	The Elements of Style
1	Ideas and Patterns for Writing
1	The Hidden Persuaders
1	The Norton Reader
1	The Harbrace College Reader
1	The Borzoi Reader
1	From Thought to Theme
1	The Conscious Reader
1	A Contemporary Rhetoric
1	The Passover Plot
1	Words and Ideas
1	Society, Systems, & Man
1	Patterns of Exposition
1	Clear Thinking
1	Telling Writing
1	The Urban Reader
1	Writing Well
1	The Responsive Chord
1	Expanded Cinema
1	The BS Factor
1	Plain Words
1	Popular Writing in America

47 citations of 35 books

Total for both English and speech teachers responding:
95 citations of 68 books

Teaching Survey

Table 25

Question #7A

How frequently do you use the following supplementary materials in the study of persuasion?

Newspaper or Magazine Editorials....Seldom or never___; Occasionally___; Frequently___

	Seldom or never		Occasionally		Frequently		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Total Responses	22	22%	56	56%	22	22%	100	100%
Two year institutions	9	16%	31	56%	15	27%	55	99%
Four year institutions	13	29%	25	56%	7	16%	45	101%
Private institutions	8	27%	17	57%	5	17%	30	101%
Public institutions	14	20%	39	56%	17	24%	70	100%
Large institutions	16	25%	33	52%	14	22%	63	99%
Small institutions	6	16%	23	62%	8	22%	37	100%
English departments	15	24%	32	52%	15	24%	62	100%
Speech departments	7	18%	24	63%	7	18%	38	99%

Teaching Survey

Table 26

Question #7B Newspaper or Magazine Ads.....Seldom or never____;

Occasionally____; Frequently____

	Seldom or never		Occa-sionally		Fre-quently		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Total Responses	18	18%	51	51%	31	31%	100	100%
Two year institutions	6	11%	26	47%	23	42%	55	100%
Four year institutions	12	27%	25	56%	8	18%	45	101%
Private institutions	8	27%	17	57%	5	17%	30	101%
Public institutions	10	14%	34	49%	26	37%	70	100%
Large institutions	11	17%	35	56%	17	27%	63	100%
Small institutions	7	19%	16	43%	14	38%	37	100%
English departments	12	19%	33	53%	17	27%	62	99%
Speech departments	6	16%	18	47%	14	37%	38	100%

Teaching Survey

Table 27

Question #7C Taped or Printed Transcripts of Political Speeches.....Seldom or never____; Occasionally____; Frequently____

	Seldom or never		Occa-sionally		Fre-quently		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Total Responses	41	41%	42	42%	18	18%	101	101%
Two year institutions	25	45%	26	47%	4	7%	55	99%
Four year institutions	16	35%	16	35%	14	30%	46	100%
Private institutions	12	40%	13	43%	5	17%	30	100%
Public instituitons	29	41%	29	41%	13	18%	71	100%
Large institutions	22	34%	27	42%	15	23%	64	99%
Small institutions	19	51%	15	41%	3	8%	37	100%
English departments	29	46%	27	43%	7	11%	63	100%
Speech departments	12	32%	15	39%	11	29%	38	100%

Teaching Survey

Table 28

Question #7D Televised Ads.....Seldom or never____;

Occasionally____; Frequently____

	Seldom or never		Occa- sionally		Fre- quently		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Total Responses	36	36%	38	38%	26	26%	100	100%
Two year institutions	16	29%	24	44%	15	27%	55	100%
Four year institutions	20	44%	14	31%	11	24%	45	99%
Private institutions	15	52%	6	21%	8	28%	29	101%
Public institutions	21	30%	32	45%	18	25%	71	100%
Large institutions	22	34%	24	38%	18	28%	64	100%
Small institutions	14	39%	14	39%	8	22%	36	100%
English departments	28	45%	21	34%	13	21%	62	100%
Speech departments	8	21%	17	45%	13	34%	38	100%

Teaching Survey

Table 29

Question #7E

Radio Ads.....Seldom or never_____;

Occasionally_____; Frequently_____

	Seldom or never		Occasionally		Frequently		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Total Responses	53	53%	41	41%	6	6%	100	100%
Two year institutions	28	51%	24	44%	3	5%	55	100%
Four year institutions	25	56%	17	38%	3	7%	45	101%
Private institutions	19	66%	9	31%	1	3%	29	100%
Public institutions	34	48%	32	45%	5	7%	71	100%
Large institutions	30	47%	28	44%	6	9%	64	100%
Small institutions	23	64%	13	36%	0	0%	36	100%
English departments	39	62%	21	33%	3	5%	63	100%
Speech departments	14	38%	20	54%	3	8%	37	100%

Teaching Survey

Table 30

Question #7F Televised News Commentaries.....Seldom or never_____;

Occasionally_____; Frequently____

	Seldom or never		Occa-sionally		Fre-quently		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Total Responses	47	48%	40	41%	10	10%	97	99%
Two year institutions	26	48%	23	43%	5	9%	54	100%
Four year institutions	21	49%	17	40%	5	12%	43	101%
Private institutions	14	52%	10	37%	3	11%	27	100%
Public institutions	33	47%	30	43%	7	10%	70	100%
Large institutions	27	44%	28	45%	7	11%	62	100%
Small institutions	20	57%	12	34%	3	9%	35	100%
English departments	33	54%	19	31%	9	15%	61	100%
Speech departments	14	39%	21	58%	1	3%	36	100%

Teaching Survey

Table 31

Question #7G Radio News Commentaries.....Seldom or never____;

Occasionally____; Frequently____

	Seldom or never		Occa-sionally		Fre-quently		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Total Responses	64	65%	34	34%	1	1%	99	100%
Two year institutions	34	62%	21	38%	0	0%	55	100%
Four year institutions	30	68%	13	30%	1	2%	44	100%
Private institutions	17	61%	10	36%	1	4%	28	101%
Public institutions	47	66%	24	34%	0	0%	71	100%
Large institutions	39	61%	25	39%	0	0%	64	100%
Small institutions	25	71%	9	26%	1	3%	35	100%
English departments	44	70%	18	29%	1	2%	63	101%
Speech departments	20	56%	16	44%	0	0%	36	100%

Teaching Survey

Table 32

Question #8 Which of the following terms best describes your overall approach to the study of persuasion?

Rhetorical___; General Semantics___; Linguistic___;

Other (please specify):_____

	Rhetorical		General Semantics		Linguistics		Other		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Total Responses	68	69%	10	10%	2	2%	19	19%	99	100%
Two year institutions	35	66%	8	15%	2	4%	8	15%	53	100%
Four year institutions	33	72%	2	4%	0	0%	11	24%	46	100%
Private institutions	23	77%	2	7%	0	0%	5	17%	30	101%
Public institutions	45	65%	8	12%	2	3%	14	20%	69	100%
Large institutions	31	58%	6	11%	1	2%	15	28%	53	99%
Small institutions	37	80%	4	8%	1	2%	4	8%	46	98%
English departments	47	75%	6	10%	0	0%	10	16%	63	101%
Speech departments	21	58%	4	11%	2	6%	9	25%	36	100%

The approaches listed under "other" included: pragmatic, social psychology, existential, logic, psychological, social science, communication theory, mass media, and various combinations of the three approaches printed on the questionnaire.

Vita

Daniel John Dieterich
807 West Clark Street
Champaign, Illinois 61820
(217) 359-1369

PERSONAL Date of Birth: June 1, 1945
Place of Birth: Chicago, Illinois
Married Two Children

WRITING EXPERIENCE

1973-75 Assistant Director, ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills located at the headquarters of the National Council of Teachers of English. Wrote and edited articles on the teaching of English and directed the activities of a staff of five writers.

1970-73 Writer, ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills. Wrote articles and abstracts on the teaching of English.

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

1969-72 Teaching Assistant at the University of Illinois. Taught introductory rhetoric and literature, took part in the film as rhetoric program, and designed and taught a rhetoric course based on a thematic approach to the subject.

1968-69 Instructor at DePaul University evening school. Taught introductory composition.

PUBLICATIONS (Selective List)

Teaching about Doublespeak--editor of a book which has been approved for publication by the National Council of Teachers of English.

"Composition Evaluation: The State of the Art," (co-author) College Composition and Communication, May 1975.

"Teaching High School Composition," English Journal, December 1973.

"Freshman English," ADE Bulletin, December 1973.

"Composition Evaluation: Options and Advice," English Journal, November 1972.

"Language in the Marketplace: On Teaching about Doublespeak," English Quarterly, Autumn 1974.

"On Teaching Shakespeare," The English Record, Summer 1973.
"Bibliography of Research in the Teaching of English," Research in the Teaching of English, semiannually since March 1973.
"The Lessons of Silence: World Literature in the English Classroom," English Journal, March 1973.
"Black Literature in the English Classroom," English Journal, January 1973.

EDUCATION

1969-76 University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign-Ph.D. in English. Dissertation Advisor: Alan Purves.

1968-69 DePaul University in Chicago-M.A. in English (with distinction)

1964-68 DePaul University in Chicago-B.A. in English (Dean's List)

AFFILIATIONS

Member of the National Council of Teachers of English and the Conference on College Composition and Communication.

PROFESSIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS

1973-76 Chairman, NCTE Committee on Public Doublespeak. Editor, Public Doublespeak Newsletter.

1974 Program participant at the conventions of the Canadian Council of Teachers of English, the National Council of Teachers of English, the Conference on College Composition and Communication, and the St. Louis Suburban Council of Teachers of English; also spoke at Governors State University and Niles College.

1975 Program participant at the conventions of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, the NCTE Secondary Section, the Oklahoma Council of Teachers of English, the Kentucky Council of Teachers of English, the Arkansas Council of Teachers of English, the Greater Louisville Council of Teachers of English, and the National Council of Teachers of English; also conducted a workshop for the English Department of the Danville (Illinois) Junior College.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

THE GRADUATE COLLEGE

January 1976

WE HEREBY RECOMMEND THAT THE THESIS BY

DANIEL JOHN DIETERICH

ENTITLED THE TRAINING OF COLLEGE STUDENTS IN ILLINOIS AS CRITICAL RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC PERSUASION

BE ACCEPTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Allen C. Reuves
Director of Thesis Research

George Hendrick
Head of Department

Committee on Final Examination†

Allen C. Reuves
Chairman

Harris W. Wilson

Jerry L. Walker

† Required for doctor's degree but not for master's.

D517